The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXVII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 1921 NUMBER 344

Contents

The Week 150

Editorials

America, Britain and Japan 152
The Uses of State Banking 154
The Marine Engineers 155
Riding the Students 157

General Articles

Waste ..... Walter N. Polakov 159
Free Speech for Admirals ..... Francis Hackett 161
Hinterlands in China ..... John Dewey 162
The Case of Anita Whitney ..... Anna Porter 165
A Day of Summer (Verse) ..... Leslie Nelson Jennings 166
The American Invasion of England ..... W. P. Crozier 166
Squirrel (Verse) ..... Alfred Kreymborg 167

A Communication ..... Richard Seelye Jones 168

Correspondence 169

Books and Things ..... P. L. 170

After the Play ..... F. H. 171

Reviews of Books

Roads to Einstein ..... Morris Cohen 172
Dynamic History ..... E. E. R. 174
Emerson ..... S. C. C. 175
Mrs. Sheridan's Book ..... R. H. 175

Selected Current Books 175

The Week

IF we were short a million and a half homes when lumber was on the free list, how much worse off shall we be if Canadian lumber, as tentatively proposed in schedule D of the Fordney bill, is subject to a twenty-five per cent ad valorem duty? Certain powerful groups are in the Capital working hard for Schedule D. What if they succeed? Representative Hamilton Fish, Jr., estimates that this twenty-five per cent protection will cost us, if we still insist on importing Canadian lumber, $200,000,000 a year. If we refuse to pay this, and fall back on our own resources, our dwindling capital of forests will be further whittled away. Our forests, heaven knows, need protection enough already, but Schedule D means the kind of protection that protects nobody but the few men who profit from the destruction of the forests.

READ carefully these words of Mr. W. A. Colston's, who is director of the Bureau of Finance of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in a memorandum to the Commission outlining the basis on which the government should settle the railroads' claims for the period of federal control: "Adjustments for changes in cost of labor . . . will include not only changes in price of labor per payroll hour or other amount paid for, but also the relation of time paid for to effective time of work. . . ." Mr. Samuel Rea of the Pennsylvania railroad is talking about the same thing when he puts in a claim to the government for $800,000,000 worth of "deferred maintenance." What both Mr. Colston and Mr. Rea propose is that the railroads be compensated for the difference between what they paid for their labor and what they think it was actually worth to them. The amount of cash actually paid can easily be found out, but how on earth can any other standard of the real value of labor be set up? Surely this is one of the strangest claims in history. If it is allowed, it will establish a precedent whereby you might extract five cents from the tobacconist because his twenty-cent cigar gave you—according to your mathematical standards of taste—only fifteen cents worth of pleasure.

THERE is every possibility that the coal comedy will repeat itself this year. Prices are so low that the dealers are begging the public to buy before winter sends them up again, and yet prices are so high that the public refuses to buy, in the hope that they will come further down. It is easy to foresee the last act: the householders, at the first touch of frost, wake up to the fact that prices are not going down after all; then a mad scramble, and finally prices soaring away out of sight. Meanwhile Senator Frelinghuysen fights hard for his Coal Industry Stabilization bills, which, he says, by no means control or regulate the industry, but only compel the operators to make the facts public. The operators, however, are not reassured. The National Coal Association sees in their passage the thin end of the wedge of paternalism and resents any attempt to squeeze out of the operators infor-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mation vital to the public. The coal industry, according to this view, is a mole; it cannot work with profit unless it works in the dark.

THE most important event of the A. F. of L. Convention, and the only one in which the public manifested any interest, was the reelection of Gompers as president, by a vote of two to one for John L. Lewis. Since Lewis and Gompers are both of the conservative wing, there was no issue involved except a personal one, and the result undoubtedly leaves the Gompers administration in a stronger position than before it was challenged. Some cynical observers have been led to question whether the contest was not staged or framed for this very purpose. Perhaps the recognition of the fact that the public likes a fight was of weight in deciding the managers to have one. Mr. Gompers announces as the objective of his fortieth term the raising of the membership of the A. F. of L. from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000. This is characteristic. The chief interest of the A. F. of L., like that of the Rotarians, the Eagles, and the Improved Order of Redmen, is in its own stupendous size; and as a national organization under Mr. Gompers it has about as much relation to the real Labor Movement as the fraternal orders.

WHEN Mr. Daniels was Secretary of the Navy, he was strongly convinced that discipline in the fleet would be improved rather than destroyed by some sort of representation for the enlisted men, and to this end the experiment of a "morale committee" was tried on the U. S. S. Michigan. Under Secretary Denby the experiment has abruptly ceased, the commander of the Michigan has been transferred, and the word has generally gone out that "Sovietism" will not be tolerated in the Navy. If we are to have a navy at all, its discipline must be complete, and no division of the command between officers and men is possible, as the Bolshevists themselves soon discovered in the case of the Red army. But nothing is so fatal to the discipline and morale of a navy as a condition in which grievances—and there will be just grievances in any navy—have no outlet. The experiment on the Michigan with the safety valve of committees, which after all was concerned with the trifles of discipline and routine, was a sensible one. Any psychologist could have told the Navy Department how valuable it would have been to let it go on, if only as an experiment. The navy, which is always exploring further into the possibilities of new guns, new armor, new explosives, shows no desire to use what science has discovered about the human half of its equipment.

DURING the last six months some twenty steamers and sailing vessels, plying along the Virginia and Carolina coasts, have disappeared, spurlos. Secretary Hoover thinks they will be found in Soviet Russian ports, and the official conviction, though "based on no official information," is that the dirty work was done by "Bolshevik buccaneers." But Lloyds, that dispassionate coroner of all marine casualties, thinks the losses due to causes more natural than piracy. And indeed the case of the schooner Carol Deering, which was sighted with all sails set, her boats gone, and no one on board, and which later piled up bow first onto Diamond Shoals, points more to abandonment by her crew than to a deed of the Jolly Roger's. Yet the government will probably continue to accuse the convenient Bolsheviks; and, if ships continue to disappear, we shall have published lists, after the fashion of New York's daily list of stolen automobiles: "Tuesday: the tramp Minnie J. Pratt, Motor number 938562, the brig Edwin G. Pease, the tanker Carol Kennicott. . . ." And as with the auto thieves, perhaps in the obscure harbors of Taganrog or Mariupol repose the former Minnie J.'s and Thomas H.'s, disguised, repainted, and renamed Ivan B., Masha T., or Pavlusha P.

BY threatening Ireland with 100,000 troops Lloyd George cannot create any new situation in Ireland. He knows this perfectly well. He has made this move simply to satisfy certain truculent elements in England and certain bitter elements in his own Cabinet. His real objective is now clearly of a political character. He probably believes that by having established the partition of Ireland he has given Ulster a strong vested interest in the settlement of Ireland and on these terms he is ready to meet de Valera and Craig and to negotiate peace. It is, on the whole, brilliant politics. The weak point in the position of Sinn Fein has been its failure to win popular support in Ulster. To gain the rest of Ireland by letting Ulster go has always aroused the strongest opposition in the breast of Sinn Fein. At the same time, if de Valera joins Craig in negotiating peace with Lloyd George it looks as though Sinn Fein had given up the mere assertion of national entity and was ready to take its stand on the principle of popular will.

ON that principle Sinn Fein can afford to stand till doomsday. It is entitled to a constituent assembly on such a principle, if any nation was ever entitled to it, and Lloyd George is too good a popular leader not to see this. He could even break

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the Tories on the issue of Ireland, if need be. He would be quite at home stumping England in the name of Irish self-determination. But the vested interest of Ulster in an Irish settlement is now the focal point of his manoeuvres. It comes down to this, that de Valera will probably be asked to choose between a modified dominion with Ulster privileged, or a substantial independence with Ulster left out. If he gives up Ulster he can obviously narrow the issue. If he insists that Ireland as a whole must decide the fate of Ulster, (Ulster taking its place as a national minority, after the fashion of minorities), he gives a tactical and in some degree a real advantage to Lloyd George. That advantage, however, is not final. In contending that Ulster is an Irish question, not a British question, the Sinn Feiners expose once more the root of the British-Irish conflict—Britain's insistence on dominating Ireland because it possesses superior brute force.

THE most important event of the present commencement season is the inauguration of James Rowland Angell as President of Yale. The presidency of the American university has come to be a most anomalous position, calling for qualities and talents the most varied. It is an office in which, to speak frankly, few men give satisfaction, and many fail. Since the old type of college president, of which Hopkins, Dwight, and McCosh were examples, went out, how many of their successors have measured up to the opportunities of the office, and in any conspicuous degree realized the expectations of trustees, alumni, faculty, students and public? The answer is tragic. President Angell sets forth on a sea charted chiefly by wrecks and derelicts. Yet we prophesy his success. No man in America is better fitted to achieve it. This fitness, the result of academic inheritance, scientific training, administrative experience, wide acquaintance and knowledge of men, has been generally commented on. Another less obvious quality which he possesses is the play of a critical and humorous intelligence which makes association with him both enlightening and enjoyable. His intellectual geniality and capacity for throwing interest into the dullest routine and the most commonplace academic business will count heavily for success in the first and most immediate circle which surrounds a university president, that of his colleagues. To his more conspicuous and generally recognized attributes we leave with confident anticipation his achievement with the wider circles, the students, the alumni, the public.

America, Britain and Japan

"UNDOUBTEDLY the scene has shifted away from Europe to the Far East and the Pacific. The problems of the Pacific are to my mind the world problems of the next fifty years or more." That is the well considered opinion of General Smuts, the ablest and clearest visioned statesman brought into prominence by the war. It is an opinion which is coming to be more and more generally held by Americans who are giving serious study to international relations. And even those who believe that the readjustment of Europe is a more difficult problem and one of more vital concern to the whole world would be ready to admit that for the United States the problem of the Pacific is paramount. It is only on the Pacific that the United States has vast, ill-defined interests to be adjusted to those of other Great Powers. The United States can not be disinterested in what happens to Siberia, China, Siam and the islands lying between the Philippines and the continent. And great as our present interest is, our future interest is bound to be greater, as the navigation and commerce of the Pacific assume the proportions that current tendencies presage.

The whole world is concerned with the Pacific, but the three Great Powers most intimately concerned are Japan, the United States and the British Empire. Japanese interests are naturally the most significant of all. We have only to consider what position Japan would have occupied if the Russians had beaten her and had established themselves in the government of Korea and all of Manchuria, with a paramount influence over China. Japan would have been forced into the rôle of a satellite state. The menace of Russia is gone, but not the greed of the Occident. Japan must be eternally vigilant if she would be safe. British interests involve the protection of concessions and spheres of influence already acquired on the Asiatic mainland, the development of trade and above all the safeguarding of India, Australia and Canada against untoward influences originating in the Far East. Trade, disarmament, and peace sum up the chief interests of the United States.

Now, so far as British and American interests are concerned, they may clash; indeed, they often will clash, but there are no foreseeable conditions that make amicable adjustments impossible. The natural relations of the American and the British peoples would compel adjustment, even if it were difficult. Armed conflict between America and the British Empire would have results so calamitous that every right thinking American affirms, with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a quasi-religious conviction, that such a conflict is unthinkable. Every right thinking Briton affirms the same thing. "To my mind," says General Smuts, "it seems clear that the only path of safety for the British Empire is a path which she can walk together with the United States." "Friendly cooperation with the United States," says Lloyd George, "is for us a cardinal principle dictated by what seems to us the proper nature of things, dictated by instinct quite as much as by reason and common sense."

But by this time every right thinking person must have learned that calamities are not to be banned simply by asserting them unthinkable. The World War, as it wrought itself out, would have been unthinkable before 1914. It is perfectly possible to maintain a friendly understanding between America and the British Empire. But that must be done through acts of goodwill and abstention from acts of actual or potential hostile bearing. Responsible statesmen recognize this necessity. That is why the British government, in moving toward a renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, is exhibiting such extreme solicitude for the attitude of the United States. And that is also why Americans who wish the friendly relations between the English speaking nations to be perpetual ought to state frankly the view prevailing, if not among the officials at Washington, who may be displaced at the next election, certainly among large groups of citizens whose views are likely to count in the end.

We believe that there are few thinking Americans who leave the possibility of sharp and serious differences with Japan altogether out of their calculations. We have observed Japanese policy in Korea, Manchuria, Shantung, Siberia. We may condone it on the ground that Japan has merely conducted herself after the fashion of European imperial Powers. But that does not make the policy inherently satisfactory in our eyes. And the extension of Japanese control over Chinese soil cannot go much farther without exciting active suspicion and hostility among the American people.

Japan is bent on consolidating and extending her control over Chinese territory. The United States is committed to the Open Door and the integrity of China. There is a definite clash of principles here. As it happens this is the only serious clash of principles involving either the United States or Japan. Twenty years ago Japan had to be on her guard against Russian aggression. Russia is now in chaos, internationally. Ten years ago Japan had to be on her guard against Germany. But Germany is now helpless and inoffensive. The United States alone stands in the way of the realization of Japanese policy in China, and Japan alone threatens the American policy of the Open Door. This conflict of principles, as Americans see it, is the one outstanding menace to the peace of the Pacific. And now England is apparently preparing to renew her alliance with Japan.

What England is to get out of the alliance is perhaps England's business, not ours. But what Japan is to get out of it concerns us vitally. We all know what Japan has already got out of the Anglo-Japanese alliance. She got the assurance that neither France nor Germany would come to the aid of Russia in the then impending conflict over Korea and Manchuria. She assured herself of immunity from European interference in her design of annexing Korea and virtually annexing southern Manchuria. She got the Secret Treaties and in consequence of them, Shantung. An instrument which has carried Japan so far in one direction may reasonably be expected to carry her farther in the same direction. But that means in the direction of a clash of interests with the United States. So obvious is this that Americans would not find it hard to believe that the renewed Anglo-Japanese alliance is as definitely directed against the United States as the original alliance was directed against Russia.

To be sure the existing Anglo-Japanese alliance excludes, by implication, the possibility of England's aiding Japan in case of war with the United States. The renewed treaty will no doubt make the same reservation more explicitly. But no reservation, however definite its terms, can make an Anglo-Japanese alliance innocuous in American eyes. Is that because Americans are groundlessly suspicious? We think not.

It is reassuring, no doubt, to know that in the event of war with Japan we shall not have British guns turned against us. But only the alarmists are contemplating war with Japan. What reasonable persons are contemplating is a long series of diplomatic moves, backed on occasion by financial or commercial pressure, which on Japan's side will be directed towards control of China, on our side towards the Open Door and Chinese integrity. An adjustment by compromise is what every sane American hopes for, and anticipates. Now, an Anglo-Japanese alliance would align the British Empire with Japan at every point in this process of adjustment. We saw in the settlement of the Shantung question how American policy could be utterly defeated without war or the remotest approach to war. Japan had assured herself of the support of the Allies through the Secret Treaties and could snap her fingers at our protests. If the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British are to back Japan in the probable succession of disputes that may draw us toward war, they will get small credit from Americans for their promise of neutrality in the improbable war. Suppose that the United States formed an alliance with France, aimed, so far as any Briton could see, at checkmating British influence. We might explicitly declare that we would in no case fight the British Empire. Yet if we played the rôle of supporter of France on the Silesian question, the separation of the Rhine Province and Bavaria from the rest of Germany, the seizure of the Ruhr, etc., the British would have very little reason to thank us for our promise of neutrality in war. A nation can be defeated and pay the penalty of defeat in diplomacy as well as in war.

But perhaps Japan is standing for a Far Eastern policy that seems right in British eyes while our policy seems wrong? We do not pretend to be a nation of saints. There are pages of aggression not easy to excuse in our own history. But we see nothing aggressive in our Far Eastern policy. We stand for the Open Door and equal treatment for all nations. We stand for the right of China to work out her own destiny in peace. What is there in such a policy that could not be accepted as fair and reasonable by Great Britain and by the British nations that will presently be more concerned than Britain herself, Canada and Australia?

The friendship of Japan has proved valuable to England, as Lloyd George has declared. England may need Japan's friendship in the future. But America does not want England to make an enemy of Japan. Neither does America want to make Japan her own enemy. The sane American view is that all three Powers ought to live at peace and can live at peace, if each difference of interest as it emerges is handled with candor and good sense. Three Powers whose interests are so largely maritime and therefore vulnerable as America, Britain and Japan ought to be able to handle such differences successfully. But the prospects of peaceful adjustment are visibly darkened if instead of a candid discussion among the three interested Powers we are to have a game between America and Japan, with Britain looking over Japan's hand and occasionally appearing to slip in a trump from another deck.

We shall not undertake to appraise the value of the gains the British Empire would derive from a renewed Japanese alliance. They may be worth the cost. But that there will be at least a partially offsetting cost is indubitable. That cost will consist in a progressive weakening of the natural bonds of sympathy between America and the British Empire.

The Uses of State Banking

CAPITALISM is in some sense a religion, not a mere formula covering the mechanics of the pursuit of private gain. At least so it appears from the attitude of the investing public toward the bonds of North Dakota. A bond issue of three millions by a state whose resources exceed three billions would ordinarily be reckoned as a gilt edged investment, especially when the state in question has practically no other funded debt—in the case of North Dakota less than a quarter of a million. An investment so heavily secured, yielding at the same time an interest rate of five and three-quarters per cent, exempt from all federal taxes, is not easily matched on the financial markets. If North Dakota had proposed to use the proceeds of the bonds in any form of unproductive expenditure whatsoever—building a scenic railway in the western hills or hanging gardens like those of ancient Babylon in the Red River valley, the loan would certainly have been oversubscribed the day the subscription books were opened. But such is not the object of the loan. The proceeds are intended for productive use through the operations of the state bank. They are meant to provide funds chiefly for loans on farms and to home builders—objects everybody considers laudable in themselves. But for this very reason the average investor holds aloof and the disposal of the bonds requires more weeks than the disposal of an unproductive loan would have taken hours. The sentiment of the investing public is that there is something radically wrong about this kind of enterprise. Therefore the investor prefers to forego the gain five and three-quarters per cent offers over the four per cent yielded by the loans of states whose ultimate solvency is by no means so certain as that of North Dakota. Does not that prove the quality of capitalistic faith? Better a substantial pecuniary loss than any concession to a movement away from private initiative in banking.

On moral grounds we find no fault with this attitude. It is a public spirited attitude, in its peculiar way. But we suggest that there is too much abstract theory in it to comport with American practicality. The free play of private initiative has worked wonders in American finance. But unrestrained private initiative does not solve every financial problem that requires solution. It is frequently urged by extreme conservatives that financial institutions should take other factors into account besides maximum profit. Observe the indignation in circles by no means radical with the institutions that have shirked the duty of using their power to stimulate building. The bankers are ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pected to exhibit public spirit in helping on the export trade, in making a success of public loans, even at some sacrifice of their private interests. There are public services involved in finance, public services which we leave to chance public spirit. That is, however, like relying on voluntary contributions for state support instead of relying on taxation.

We need the enterprise and the mobility of the private financial institutions, but we need also systematic provision for the public interests involved in credit supply. It is to the interest of the state that agriculture should be financed by loans that run for long terms and make provision for postponement of interest payment in case of crop failure. Why should a private institution which can easily place all its funds in short term paper take upon itself the duty of supplying this need? It is to the interest of the state that as many families as possible should own the homes they live in. Should the state trust to the volunteering of private financial institutions to meet this public need? Then the public need will never be well served. Granting the perpetuation of the present economic system the rational plan would be to establish public financial institutions alongside of the private ones, and hold the former to the provision for public needs while leaving the latter untrammeled to pursue their private interest.

Of course it is not possible to delimit the field in advance, nor would this be desirable. With the public and private institutions working together there is no doubt that the public functions would gravitate to the public institutions while the functions involving only private gain would gravitate to the private institutions, unless, of course the public institutions proved so efficient that they could perform all the functions of banking more cheaply than private institutions. We leave it to the bankers to say whether there is much likelihood of this result.

The establishment of a bank by the State of North Dakota is not a freakish nor a radical act. It is a step toward a differentiation of financial functions required by the common interest. It is not to the point whether the management of the Bank of North Dakota is efficient or not; though we believe that it is. Still less is it to the point what the peculiar doctrines of the officials in charge may happen to be, though we believe that properly understood there is nothing extravagant in them. What is to the point is that North Dakota is pioneering in a direction that one neighboring state after another will have to follow, sooner or later. Whether this is done under radical or under conservative auspices, it matters little. The states will have to concern themselves with problems of economic development, unless they are to fall to the rank of geographical nonentities in an age of intensified economic development. They will need a financial arm for the work. And the private financial institutions ought to give their support to the creation of an organ that will relieve them of the necessity of being conscripted for public service. Incidentally that would liberate them from the hostility that is always directed against them when the attention of the people is concentrated upon a public need neglected in consequence of the preoccupation of private institutions with private gain.

The Marine Engineers

THE Marine Engineers are going back to their engine-rooms under the terms agreed to between themselves and the Shipping Board—terms which fall disappointingly short of what they had fought for, terms which must leave in the minds of these skilled, almost professional men not a little bitterness and discontent. Yet in one particular these terms are better than those the private owners would have imposed if they could; at least they involve an agreement with, a recognition of the Engineers' Association to run till the end of the year. The shipowners want no such recognition; they have sworn among themselves never again to "have any signed agreements with any seagoing labor organization." This is not very far removed from the state of mind of the Shipping Board during the strike, and since the Shipping Board is planning eventually to turn all its vessels into private hands, the future of our merchant marine, its efficiency in general, and more particularly the efficiency—or otherwise—of the men that sail the ships rests with these private owners.

It was concern for this future—a desperate one it seemed to them—which caused the owners to make the demands that led to the strike. A smaller proportion of American exports, they pointed out, was being carried in American bottoms last winter than a year ago, and things had come to such a pass, through the cutting of foreign rates to our disadvantage, that American shipping needed to save every possible fraction of a cent per ton it could. No one will dispute the general truth of this, nor its seriousness for us, but behind the shipowners' desire to save the pennies was plainly visible another desire: they were tired and also afraid of the power of the marine unions, and they wanted to return to that lost Arcadia where nothing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stood between the commands of those who owned the ships and the complete individual obedience of those who manned them. If they were bent on economy, they were no less moved by an old and deep tradition of the sea—something that never was found on land—the tradition, born of the sea's perils and emergencies, of discipline;—a relic of the days of sailing vessels, a psychology that makes human relations on board ships more like those of the army or navy than those of the factory.

What was the practical result of this during the strike? Some pennies were saved, of course, but no one will ever know how many millions were wasted. No one will ever be able to count up the loss in fuel that need not have been burned, in repairs that might not have been necessary. Every engine has its individuality, and wherever a green engineer was taken on to pull levers and turn wheels he had never seen before, the engine room was below par. Many were the stories of ships broken down in mid-ocean, of ships adding unnecessary days to their normal turn-around, of coal wasted, of gauges breaking in some stranger's care. Many also were the stories of the large sums offered to "scab" engineers.

Of course one must be willing to pay the price of waste and inefficiency in the present for the sake of future economies. But what per cent of ultimate stability is the insurance premium of present chaos paid by the ship owners, nobody can calculate, certainly not themselves. Nor is this future too certain. The engineers will almost certainly not be reinstated in the positions they formerly held, in the engine rooms they had worked in for years and knew how to run. There will be months of readjustment, and during the readjustment of new men to strange engines there will be gauges broken, machinery damaged, avoidable repairs, wasted coal. Even provided the men shake from their minds all the rancor of defeat, there is bound to be inefficiency.

But the engineers are not men who can easily forget their defeat. They are likely to remember that the Shipowners' Association fumed at the "lawless un-American spirit underlying the present attack on the American Merchant Marine." They will remember too that the Shipowners' Association planned "to organize among the best of our Engineers an Association that would act in harmony with and not in antagonism to the Ship Companies." Can men give their best efforts to serve employers who have determined to destroy their organization of self-defence? Would they be human if they were to forget all this and work as hard and ungrudgingly as they know how? One need not waste time over the morality of "slacking" under whatever circumstances; but the tendency of antagonized, defeated men to do so is a rule of nature, to be reckoned with in a dollars and cents view of the merchant marine as much as with any inconstancies of wind or weather. Did the shipowners, who count these dollars and cents so carefully, reckon on the temper of the men? The owners demand loyalty; what are they prepared to pay for it? Above all, men are loyal to themselves, and if they can be made to feel that loyalty to others will also serve themselves, they will be loyal. But in this case, as in others, loyalty is its own reward.

A grudging state of mind, in which sabotage is easily conceived and nurtured, would not be anything new where the engineers and the shipowners are concerned. While throughout the ranks of the engineers as a whole before the strike, as would be natural to men who have given their lives to one skilled calling, professional pride was strong, there was yet a certain amount of sabotage. Admiral Benson referred to it when he said that the practice of pay for overtime had been subject to gross abuse. As we learned late last year, the shipping business is honeycombed with petty graft and petty thievery. But graft and thievery are not born in a vacuum. The engineers were expected to work at 100 per cent efficiency, to keep down repairs, to buy no supplies that were not necessary. But all about them they saw graft and inefficiency: ships piling up thousands in demurrage at foreign ports because the home office had bungled or delayed the details of their unloading; costly and unnecessary new machinery; ship chandlers fattening on the carelessness of owners in ordering supplies. Dollars leaked through innumerable holes which the owners could have stopped had they put their minds to it: with this example of waste before him you can blame him if you like—but what do you propose to do to make the engineer stop the little trickle he can prevent?

Another thing: professional pride has its limits. Suppose the engineer takes a decent, but not enthusiastic amount of pains, what must be done before he will put forward the best that is in him? What, aside from an impalpable increase to his professional pride, will it profit him if he does his best? He has no stake in the business beyond his own job and salary; and though a partner in the labor, he does not share in the least in the profit his labor helps to produce. The engineer, with the rest of us, has grown; he has built up his organization for the protection of his interests, of his minimum. He is groping for more, and will be uneasy and far from 100 per cent efficient until he gets

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

something like it. Call it cooperation, call it co-partnership, a share in the profits, or in management, call it by any name that means a return to the engineer, in money or in the less tangible currency of satisfaction, from the effort he contributes to his profession.

The shipowners have two courses open to them. The worst of the two they seem to be in the process of choosing, with an obstinacy that no words of ours or anybody's are likely to shake. They are building on the past of individual initiative, individual loyalty and obedience. They are building on the philosophy of the open shop, the belief that though workingmen have learned to act collectively, they shouldn't do it, or that it doesn't matter. They can, on the other hand, lay out a new course in seas that, to be sure, are still uncharted. They can begin by learning that landlubbers have profited from bonus plans, from partnership plans like Mr. Hapgood's factory in Indianapolis, from the industrial government in the clothing trades, from all the successes or experiments in cooperation, where men do their level best not only for money, but because they are a living part of the business they labor at. They can learn, for instance, that cooperation with the employee has a healthy effect on dividends, and that human nature, and the science of treating it decently, of satisfying its normal wants, makes the difference between fewer dollars and cents or more of them.

Riding the Students

IF college instructors were organized Dr. Miller would be expelled from the union, for exposing in the New Republic of June 22nd the most cherished secret of the craft—viz., that college lecturing is not the acme of human toil but, as he pleasantly says, "the most comfortable mode of respiration during the class hour," an agreeable kind of athletics suited to the sedentary habit of the professor. It is a form of mental catharsis without which a certain type of intellect cannot continue in health. It is perhaps true that lecturing is continued in colleges, in the face of more approved methods of teaching, because the professors need it both for stimulus and relief, and without it would become mentally constipated and languid. In the same way it may be questioned whether the sermon is not primarily important in these days for keeping the clergyman in good condition, and mobilizing his thought. Above all, the position of both teacher and preacher depends upon authority, and the first principle of authority is internal self-confidence. How many clergymen would find their faith wavering if they did not have the duty and privilege of confirming it each Sabbath by their own word of mouth? How many instructors would be confused and baffled before the vast array of fact, interpretation, hypothesis, and surmise, were it not for the decisions ex cathedra which they make daily? The story is certainly not apocryphal of the professor who, asked if he knew a certain phase of his subject, replied: "No, I have never lectured upon it."

The oral functions of preacher and professor may thus be held to exist primarily for the individuals who hold these offices, and to depend upon the monopoly of pulpit and platform afforded by institutions which control them. But these institutions, increasingly under financial pressure, are finding it more and more difficult to keep their functionaries in the state of life to which they have become accustomed. In view of this situation we have a suggestion to offer to those who find themselves responsible for the financial guidance of all institutions which afford large opportunities for human speech. Why not rent the listeners, as the riding school does horses? A college, for instance, may possess a hundred high-schooled audiences available at every hour of the day, varying in size from eight or ten to five hundred, and trained to listen with flattering attention to remarks on all subjects of human interest, and on others. The audiences vary not only in size but in temper and vivacity, though most of them are kind, docile, and will not throw the least practised speaker. What could be more exhilarating, we ask, to the amateur, the dilettante in learning than an hour's exercise each day on one of these audiences? It is true, these audiences are regularly trained to go rather less than an hour, but some of the older ones, hardy and well seasoned, small and wiry, will do two hours at a stretch. The churches have nothing like this opportunity, being limited to a single audience a week, usually a feeble and listless one, not good for more than a half hour at most of road work. But there are exceptions. To ride Billy Sunday's audience would be like taking the thirty-third degree in masonry.

There is no doubt that the demand for this form of exercise already exists. During the late war the American people developed an enormous appetite for speech; every patriot desired to confirm publicly his faith in the justice of our cause, so that the ridiculously short time limit of four minutes had to be adopted to protect theatre and other audiences from abuse. Some of these oratorical equestrians discovered and tapped the sources of listening to which we have already referred, somewhat to the discomfiture of the regular practition-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers, who, however, yielded gracefully in the name of patriotism. But one teacher in a school which, on account of its vicinity to the Chamber of Commerce, was exploited with undue frequency, complained that the children were ridden to death.

This freedom of speech should of course be forbidden, and a scale of prices provided according to the size of the audience, with appropriate reductions for regular engagements. Practised speakers who, so far from wearying audiences leave them rather more in spirits than they find them should also be taken at reduced rates. Much would depend upon the weight, seat and hands of the rider. Naturally the institution, like the riding school, would demand appropriate guarantees or tests to cover these points, and not entrust its big, high-mettled audiences to clumsy or ignorant learners. For while in general college audiences can be trusted not to bolt, or throw the rider, much less to trample on him if he happen to fall off, yet regrettable incidents have occurred in the case of the over ambitious. We remember that during the recent war a professor from Princeton in the employ of the National Security League proposed to

> turn and wind the fiery Pegasus
> And witch the world with noble horsemanship,

at the expense of the entire embattled Student Army Training Corps of the University of Wisconsin. The audience had been out in the rain and was wet and restless; the rider sat heavily in the saddle and yanked violently at the fiery creature's mouth, as he urged it down the hard paved road of presidential pronouncements about democracy. The audience pranced and pitched. The speaker challenged and swore. The audience reared and fell over backward, and the speaker was killed, so far as the Security League was concerned, which charged the university with treason. But such incidents are unusual.

We can imagine that in the enthusiasm excited by this proposal some zealous trustees and business managers will cry: Why pay a faculty or clergy at all? Of course professors and clergymen would not become entirely superfluous. They would be needed to perform the ordinary duties about their audiences, to keep them clean and well groomed, to rub them down if by chance they should be overridden, and ride them occasionally to be sure that they were not learning to break and forgetting to single-foot. But in general their duties would be light. And suppose the tariff were fixed at an average of $10 per audience, and a university had 100 audiences a day (some have 1,000) the increase in university revenues would be enormous. Student fees would be but a drop in the bucket—indeed competition might make it necessary to reduce them. This would certainly be advisable in the case of students taking more than the required number of courses, and thus listening more than the normal two hours a day. One of the duties remaining to the faculty would be to see that the morale of the institution was maintained. Some students can listen for four or five hours a day, and retain a certain appearance of attention and even responsiveness; others grow dull and languid, yawn and nod, in less than one hour. It would be the duty of the faculty on the one hand to see that no student listened more than was good for him, and on the other that those who listened less were expelled for the good of the institution. With such usefulness remaining to him, the professor should find his salary enormously increased, and as for the retiring allowance—the term would be a joke.

And yet, we doubt not, professors will hold back, reluct, crab, oppose, sabotage, as they do whenever a notable reform is proposed. We know them better than Mr. Coolidge does—and they are a conservative lot, and sentimental. They enjoy their lectures; they love their audiences. Do you remember the story of the Arab sheik who killed his mare rather than let her fall into the hands of his adversaries? We may have a new form of tragedy in our literature, the professor asked to surrender his platform to an amateur of large wealth, who deliberately turns on the gas and sings his swan song to the dying class. Altogether we expect considerable opposition to our suggestion from vested academic interests, but we have confidence that trustees and other progressive bodies will see its merit and speedily force its adoption.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1921, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER; DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY — ALVIN JOHNSON
FRANCIS HACKETT — WALTER LIPPMANN
PHILIP LITTELL — ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS, FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Waste

IF American industry, personified by its captains, financiers and managers had been indicted by a grand jury for murder, arson and disorderly conduct in conspiracy to overthrow the existing government and to restrain trade, it would have caused a great sensation. On June 3, 1921 at St. Louis, Missouri, seventeen industrial experts, engineers appointed by Mr. Herbert Hoover, representing about 200,000 engineers of this country, organized in the Federation of American Engineering Societies, adopted and made public, at least in abstract, a report of the Committee on Elimination of Waste in Industry. This committee was not a casual list of incompetent jurors—it was a representative body of industrial counsellors, whose demonstrated ability to reduce waste is widely known. Neither could these men possibly be suspected of un-americanism or extremism. By nature, conviction and income, they are and they desire to be conservative. Least of all, do they seek sensation. Yet their findings, if stated in legal terms, might exhaust the vocabulary of our Criminal Code. In their own words, this report "discloses losses and waste due to the restraint and dissipation of the creative power of those who work in industry" and, they think, "it lays the foundation for knowledge of the destructive influences" controlling our industrialism.

This engineering report is permeated from start to finish with that concept of "rendering rigorous service" which was pronounced and established by H. L. Gantt, in his Organizing for Work, and in my Principles of Industrial Philosophy. Let us hope it will be published in full and followed by further investigations of other branches of industry, agriculture, commerce, business and banking. Its value can hardly be overstated. Even with such limitations as it possesses and which I will point out later on, it is to be commended because its first function is to stimulate fundamental, rigorous thinking about facts which are little known. Its ultimate triumph will be in preventing revolution by substituting for it constructive changes with the clearly defined aim of service.

What are then the findings of these engineers? "Waste," they found, "results from an interruption of production, low production, restriction of production and lost production."

Let us see what it means.

Interruption of production is only too well known to us today when over 5,000,000 men with 20,000,000 dependents are locked out, jobless, nearing hourly destitution if not desperation. We have had periodic crises: 1893, 1907—8, 1914, 1920, when production was restrained in order to maintain high prices which the limited earnings of the population were unable to meet. We also know that seasonal interruption of production in the majority of industries is artificially created. We know too that production is interrupted when men are sick and that our state of industrial hygiene is such that 42,000,000 persons are losing about 350,000,000 working days' production per year due to accidents and sickness of which 42 per cent are preventable; authorities agree that 75 per cent of deaths and serious accidents in American industry can be prevented by using methods already perfected. Intermittent employment is likewise preventable for it is due to lack of coordination between related industries, the failure of management to link up sales policies with production policies, lack of planning, lack of research, speculative purchases, shut downs for inventory-taking instead of using permanent inventories, etc.

Low production is likewise a time-honored ill of our industries. The report does not evaluate loss of productivity by comparing what is being done with what can be done but merely with what actually is accomplished in the best existing establishments. This method makes their findings ultra conservative, placing waste between thirty per cent and forty per cent while actually we produce much less than one half of what we could if we cared to. Obviously the losses of this class are also preventable, for this form of waste represents nothing but failure to apply fully our resources of knowledge, means of production, and materials. Modern technology and management engineering possess today a vast amount of knowledge which is not used. Plants are usually over-equipped in anticipation of future growth and nearly half of the machinery constantly remains unproductive. Stocks of raw materials purchased in speculation and stocks of finished and semi-finished goods are much in excess, usually from four to ten times larger than is reasonably necessary.

Restriction of production, on which the report apparently lays considerable stress, is, similarly, purely an artificial ill. It is due, we are told, to many causes, such as fear of dropping prices if an adequate amount of goods is produced, and to the fact that only owners of patents, trade marks and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other protective legalities can produce certain useful goods and can restrain others from doing so, etc.

It is also found that the employees restrict output, but while they are doing so by "limiting the rate of speed of output of individual workmen," says the report, the employers "usually limit the total output of an industry." Limited individual output, of course, could be more than offset by employment of a larger number of men but limitation of the output of an entire industry creates both shortage of goods for the whole country (and high prices) and shortage of employment.

From even this brief review of some outstanding phases of this report, it is quite clear that its conclusion, featured in the daily press, showing that 50 per cent of waste at least is due to management while loss due to labor is but 25 per cent, is not an exaggeration, but a decided soft-pedaling. For what are, after all, the factors in waste caused by labor? Incompetence, slow working and conflicts are the chief ones. Yet it is the duty of the management to train workers and to make them competent and skilful. Slow rate of work, likewise, is partly a reaction against the unreasonable attitude of many managers in cutting the piece rates, while partly an altruistic attempt to relieve the suffering of those unemployed—1,000,000 persons *"normally"* and over 5,000,000 today,—by offering them room in industry. Lastly, the waste caused by conflicts and strikes is dismissed by the report as "much less than popularly supposed" and as occurring chiefly in seasonal industries.

Let us stop here for a while and ask ourselves a question: What is waste and what is its significance? Let us keep away from metaphysics and supernatural speculations. In positive science, we deal with only three measures: space, matter and time; everything else is derived from these. Waste, therefore, to be real and not fictitious, must be reckoned in these units. If the cause does not produce the possible maximum result—we call it a waste, waste of space, waste of material, waste of time or any function of these—like waste of energy, waste of life, waste of knowledge.

Now, let us go a step farther. Nature does not know losses. Matter cannot be annihilated nor can energy be dissipated. It does not make any difference for the universe whether it takes 10,000 years or 100,000 years for the fern to become anthracite for there is nothing lost in this process of making coal out of plants. Yet, if mortal man will not reckon with the *time* that his work takes, he will rapidly be reduced to a savage state and the population of the world will shrink to a number which Nature unaided could feed, clothe and house. It is thus plain that *time is the only necessary and sufficient measure of human progress and of human waste.*

With this measure we can evaluate the significance of our losses. Waste of one ton of coal unproductively burned under a boiler does not mean the loss of 2,000 pounds of carbon and other elements, for they are still present in the air, and ashes may even be usefully employed in road building. Loss of five dollars is not loss either—it is simply money passed from hand to hand. But this ton of coal is one of the thousand which a miner has dug out during a year of his life. He worked two hundred days a year and this one ton represents one hour and thirty-six minutes of his life. If we waste, because of reckless methods of firing, twenty-five per cent of our coal, it does not mean that we waste $750,000,000 but that we waste the lives of 150,000 men each year, not only utterly uselessly for the country, but we keep them in a needless treadmill, in solitary confinement underground! Similarly, if we have built a machine and use it only half the time, what we waste is half of the productive life-time of those who invented, designed and built that machine. Likewise, if we keep materials and ideas idle, we dissipate the life-time of those who worked them out and we imperil, and sometimes actually destroy, the lives of those from whose use these goods and ideas were withheld.

In the absence of this clear, definitely human measurement and evaluation of industrial wastes we see a tragic shortcoming in this report. Of all the people, the engineers should have been the last ones to confuse the dimensions! The engineers would scoff at one who added yards to cubic inches or attempted to measure the strength of a bridge in gallons. Yet, living in an age of double standards, they blundered themselves, confusing classes, all their college training in mathematically correct thinking notwithstanding. The report pathetically attempts to express the harm of idle equipment in billions of dollars, preventable disease and death as equal to $3,000,000,000, as if each human cadaver has a value of so much a pound!

Material wealth and its possession is in space. It can be acquired, exchanged and moved from one place to another, whereas human creative capacity can be measured only in time, not only because our life-time has a supreme value and cannot

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be indefinitely extended, but because men are the only living creatures that can bind time and the achievements of the past generations with the present, pass on their knowledge and render service to the future. Moreover, because time is the only thing that stands between the cause and the effect, we cannot think correctly unless we are careful in analyzing what is the cause and what is the effect.

The engineering report falls into the tenets of this time-honored fallacy. It attempts to measure the human worth of life in yards, tons and dollars —all space measures, instead of measuring it in the units of a life-time, say in the hours of man's life which were either wasted in producing something which is unnecessary or harmful, or in producing something, which though necessary, is unduly slow or which is not lasting.

Still another deplorable limitation of this report is that it mysteriously confuses causes and effects. Waste is described as a result of idleness, restriction and interruption of production, etc. Yet idleness, etc., *is* the waste, or at least, is the act of wasting time, i. e., life and of life-sustaining production. But let us assume that waste is understood by the writers of the report in the lower dimension, i. e., as mere loss of monetary profit. Even so, there is no evidence that the restraint of production or sales policy is the cause; it is in itself caused by an economic regime where waste is a system. The report thus fails to live up to its proclaimed purpose to "lay the foundation for knowledge."

Because of this timidity of the authors of the report to get to the fundamental cause of industrial wastes, their recommendations are also not fundamental but palliative, based on the uncritical assumption that the powers that be of our economic society are willing to eliminate waste. Yet an element of doubt may be suspected in that the "proposed program" calls for "governmental assistance" as a coordinating and coercive agency, forcing the carnage of "taking" into orderly "rendering service."

To conclude this brief review of the momentous engineering report on Waste, one should remember the noble hope of its authors, that "from this knowledge will grow the certain vision that *mental and moral forces must be added* to the physical resources now employed, if industry is to serve all . . ." Indeed, an industry as described, devoid of mental force and lacking in morality, is but a monstrous Frankenstein—the author of his own undoing and a scourge to all mankind.

WALTER N. POLAKOV.

Free Speech for Admirals

IT isn't every nation that can present another nation with an admiral. Most admirals are home-raised. But one of the finest things Bolshevist Russia ever did was to give us our splendid Admiral Simski. He may not be the most discreet man in the world, brave old Simski, but isn't it a glorious thing when an honest man speaks right out, discretion or no discretion? We who love the truth, how grateful we must feel when a bluff sea-dog takes the bone of truth in his teeth and gnaws on it publicly. Too long we have endured unbearable silence on many matters. May Russia give us more admirals if they prove to be so outspoken as Admiral Simski.

We should like an admiral, for example, who would say just what he feels about the honorableness of the Japanese in China. That would be very helpful. And a few timely indiscreet remarks about Sinn Feiners, Zionists, Poles, Czechs, Anglo-Americans, Afro-Americans, and others mixing up in foreign politics—that would be all to the good. Also, we need an admiral to tell us home truths about the excess profit tax and the Shipping Board and the late Interchurch Movement and the sudden collapse of Y. W. C. A. social ideals. Why not? Another fair chance for naval indiscretion would be some comment on the honest British supervision of our trade cables and trade correspondence and the surprising loss of orders that this harmless habit entails. Also, how much was paid by honest America for German patent rights—that would invite a little useful indiscretion. With plenty of indiscretion to count on, life is sure to become more interesting and it is fine to have this fact recognized by Simski's friends. Less dignity, less reticence, less hidebound conservatism in international relationships—that is what these jolly incendiaries advocate. What we need is to pay less attention to gag-rules, censorship, Lusk "sedition" charges and the whole attempt to govern free speech and free indiscretion. What we need are unbridled opinions, loose tongues, talking admirals. No muzzles on anyone! Well, only on teachers and editors and clergymen and reformers. Certainly no muzzle on admirals.

That's what they felt when Simski recently turned up in Moscow, and the Bolshevists organized their greeting to him. It was a grand and glorious occasion. To the ball-room of Prince Popkin the workers thronged for the big reception, and in their dingy clothes they flooded the great pompous chamber. Its beautiful hangings were gone, and its loose ornaments, but the vast mirrors

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remained and the multiple chandeliers, and in spite of the workers, men and women, the room kept a palatial style. In its centre, opposite the triple doors, Comrade Sokoff greeted the arriving delegates. Sokoff wore a plain black blouse with his trousers gathered into soft high boots. At his side stood the tall guest of honor, Admiral Simski. On a platform next the wall stood chairs waiting for both of these, placed on a small square of carpet. Simski's speech was scheduled for eight-thirty.

At eight-thirty Sokoff escorted the gallant admiral to the little platform. The assembled workers meanwhile helped themselves to camp-chairs stacked in one corner of Popkin's ball-room, and without much fuss had seated themselves in groups facing the speaker.

"I am glad to be home once again," said Simski, in answer to warm applause. "You all know that at heart I am Bolshevist and believe above everything in the Bolshevist-American alliance. Good Heavens, wasn't I born in Siberia! I understand, and you understand, that there isn't anything in this hyphen business when it comes to a blood tie like ours. As Gogol might have said, I wear my hyphen with a difference.

"In my own country, it is true, some miserable Englishmen still survive who keep up a lot of anti-Bolshevist talk. And to get their jackass vote our bourgeois politicians are willing to do anything. You workers know all about this sort of thing. You know what sort of a joke American democracy is. But don't believe for a minute that I forget what the English tried to do to your Republic at the time our President was saying, 'More power to the Soviets.' I know the sort of dirty work England did at Archangel and I don't forget it. And whenever I see an Englishman I know what I think of him.

"Yes, some English fought with us. I admit that. But I am remembering Kolchak, Denikin, Yudenitch and the rest. I am remembering the underhand and treacherous policy of these English, stabbing Russia in the back. And for that reason you can depend on good old Simski. Always! Am I terrorized by any fathead American who is anti-Bolshevist? Do I quail before the bourgeoisie of my own country? Not on your life. I have decided that the best thing is for my country to get on well with the Bolshevists and to see eye to eye with them, even if my country has to be blind. Having made this momentous decision all by myself, I do not intend to let any jackass say me neigh.

"Do I hear applause? I want no applause. I am a plain, blunt sea-dog and I care for nothing but my adopted country and my own Bolshevist affiliations. Well, if you insist on decorating me with the Order of the Proletaire, how can I refuse? But, remember, I stick to my principles. I am for a Bolshevist-American alliance on land, on the sea, under the sea and in the air. Hurrah for the Bolshevists and down with the English!"

Great applause greeted these words. Lenin and Trotsky now appeared and kissed Simski on both cheeks. He was taken promptly to Mrs. Sheridan, who dashed off his bust in twenty minutes. Then the Street Cleaners, the Lamplighters, the Furniture Movers and the Gasfitters conferred honorary degrees on him. They waited on him at his hotel and gave him a ration of butter. Laden with these honors, Simski sailed back to the Land of the Jackass Vote, where a thousand policemen protected his arrival from his loving admirers.

It is a good story and it makes me happy to live in a country where foreign policy is in the right hands. We can't tolerate any civilian dictatorship. Free speech for admirals!

FRANCIS HACKETT.

Hinterlands in China

ONE of the two Presidents of China—it is unnecessary to specify which—recently stated that a renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance meant a partition of China. In this division, Japan would take the north and Great Britain the south. Probably the remark was not meant to be taken literally in the sense of formal conquest or annexation, but rather symbolically with reference to the tendency of policies and events. Even so, the statement will appear exaggerated or wild to persons outside of China who either believe that the Open Door policy is now irrevocably established or that Japan is the only foreign Power which China has to fear. But a recent visit to the south revealed that in that section, especially in Canton, the British occupy much the same position of suspicion and dread which is held by the Japanese in the north.

Upon the negative side, the Japanese menace is negligible in the province of Kwantung, in which Canton is situated. There are said to be more Americans in Canton than Japanese, and the American colony is not extensive. Upon the positive side the history of the Cassell collieries contract is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

instructive. It illustrates the cause of the popular attitude toward the British, and quite possibly explains the bitterness in the remark quoted. The contract is noteworthy from whatever standpoint it is viewed, whether that of time, of the conditions it contains or of the circumstances which accompany it.

Premising that the contract delivers to a British company a monopoly of the rich coal deposits of the province for a period of ninety years and—quite incidentally of course—the right to use all means of transportation, water or rail, wharves and ports now in existence, and also to "construct, manage, superintend and work other roads, railways, waterways as may be deemed advisable"—which reads like a monopoly of all further transportation facilities of the province—first take up the time of the making of the contract. It was drawn in April of last year and confirmed a few months later. It was made, of course, with the authorities of the Kwantung province, subject to confirmation at Peking. During this period, Kwantung province was governed by military carpet-baggers from the neighboring province of Kwangsei, which was practically alone of the southern provinces allied with the northern government, then under the control of the Anfu party. It was matter of common knowledge that the people of Canton and of the province were bitterly hostile to this outside control and submitted to it only because of military coercion. Civil strife for the expulsion of the outsiders was already going on, continually gaining headway, and a few months later the Kwangsei troops were defeated and expelled from the province by the forces of General Chen, now the civil governor of Kwantung, who received a triumphal ovation upon his entrance into Canton. At this time the present native government was established, a change which made possible the return of Sun Yat Sen and his followers from their exile in Shanghai. It is evident, then, that the collieries contract giving away the natural resources of the people of the province, was knowingly made by a British company with a government which no more represented the people of the province than the military government of Germany represented the people of Belgium during the war.

As to the terms of the contract, the statement that it gave the British company a monopoly of all the coal mines in the province, was not literally accurate. Verbally, twenty-two districts are enumerated. But these are the districts along the lines of the only railways in the province and the only ones soon to be built, including the as yet uncompleted Hankow-Canton railway. Possibly this fact accounts for the anxiety of the British partners in the Consortium that the completion of this line be the first undertaking financed by the Consortium. The document also includes what is perhaps a novelty in legal documents having such a momentous economic importance, namely, the words "etc." after the districts enumerated by name.

For this concession, the British syndicate agreed to pay the provincial government the sum of $1,000,000 (*silver of course*). This million dollars is to bear six per cent interest to the company, and capital and interest are to be paid back to the company by the provincial government out of the dividends (if any) it is to receive. The nature of these "dividends" is set forth in an article which should receive the careful attention of promoters elsewhere as a model of the possibilities of exploiting contracts. The ten million capital is divided equally into "A" shares and "B" shares. The "A" shares go unreservedly to the directors of the company, and three millions of the "B" shares are to be allotted by the directors of the company at their discretion. The other two million are again divided into equal portions, one portion representing the sum advanced by the company to the province and to be paid back as just specified, while the other million—one-tenth of the capitalization—is to be a trust fund the dividends of which are to go for the "benefit of the poor people of the province" and for an educational fund for the province. But before any dividends are paid upon the "B" shares, eight per cent dividends are to be paid upon the "A" shares and a *dollar a ton royalty* upon all coal mined. Those having any familiarity with the coal business with its usual royalty of about ten cents a ton can easily calculate the splendid prospects of the "poor people" and the schools, prospects which represent the total return to the provinces of a concession of untold worth. The contract also guarantees to the company the assistance of the provincial government in expropriating the owners of all coal mines which have been granted to other companies but not yet worked. These technical details make dry reading, but they throw light upon the spirit with which the British company undertook its predatory negotiations with a government renounced by the people it professed to govern. In comparison with the relatively crude methods of Japan in Shantung, they show the advantages of wide business experience.

As for the circumstances and context which give added menace to the contract, the following facts are significant. Hong Kong, a British crown colony, lies directly opposite the river upon which Canton is situated. It is the port of export and import

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the vast districts served by the mines and railways of the province. It is unnecessary to point out the hold upon all economic development which is given through a monopolistic control of coal. It is hardly too much to say that the enforcement of the contract would enable British interests in Hong Kong to control the entire industrial development of the most flourishing of the provinces of China. It would be a comparatively easy and inexpensive matter to provide the main land with a first class modern harbor and port near Canton. But such a port would tend to reduce the assets of Hong Kong to the possession of the most beautiful scenery in the world. There is already fear that a new harbor will be built. Many persons think that the concession of building such railways etc., " as are deemed advisable for the purpose of the business of the company and to improve those now existing" is the object of the contract, even more than the coal monopoly. For the British already own a considerable part of the mainland, including part of the railway connecting the littoral with Canton. By building a cross-cut from the British owned portion of this railway to the Hankow-Canton line, the latter would become virtually the Hankow-Hong Kong line, and Canton would be a way-station. With the advantages thus secured, the project for building a new port could be indefinitely blocked.

During the period in which the contract was being secured, a congress of British Chambers of Commerce was held in Shanghai. Resolutions were passed in favor of abolishing henceforth the whole principle of special nationalistic concessions, and of cooperating with the Chinese for the upbuilding of China. At the close of the meeting the Chairman announced that a new era for China had finally dawned. All of the British newspapers in China lauded the wise action of the Chambers. At the same time, Mr. Lamont was in Peking, and was setting forth that the object of the Consortium was the abolition of further concessions, and the uniting of the financial resources of the banks in the Consortium for the economic development of China itself. By an ironical coincidence, the Hong Kong-Shanghai Bank, which is the financial power behind the contract and the new company, is the leading British partner in the Consortium. It is difficult to see how any of the British can henceforth accuse the Japanese of bad faith if any of the banking interests of that country should enter upon independent negotiations with any government in China.

By the time the scene of action was transferred to Peking in order to secure the confirmation of the central government, the Anfu regime was no more, and as yet no confirmation has been secured. The new government at Canton has declined to recognize the contract as having any validity. An official of the Hong Kong government has told an official of the Canton government that the Hong Kong government stands behind the enforcement of the contract, and that Kwantung province is a British Hinterland. Within the last few weeks the Governor of Hong Kong and a leading Chinese banker of Hong Kong who is a British subject have visited Peking. Rumors were rife in the south as to the object of the visit. British sources published the report that one object was to return Weihaiwei to China—in case Peking agreed to turn over more of the Kwantung mainland to Hong Kong as a quid pro quo. Chinese opinion in the south was that one main object was to secure the Peking confirmation of the Cassell contract, in which case $900,000 more would be forthcoming, $100,000 having been paid down when the contract was signed with the provincial government. Peking does not recognize the present Canton government but regards it as an outlaw. The crowd that signed the contract is still in control of the neighboring province of Kwangsei and they are relied upon by the north to effect the military subjugation of the seceded province. Fighting has already, indeed, begun, but the Kwangsei militarists are badly in need of money; if Peking ratifies the contract, a large part of the funds will be paid over to them —all that isn't lost by the wayside to the northern militarists. Meantime British news agencies keep up a constant circulation of reports tending to discredit the Kwantung government, although all impartial observers on the spot regard it as altogether the most promising one in China.

These considerations not only throw light on some of the difficulties spoken of in a previous article concerning the functioning of the Consortium, but they give an indispensable background for judging the actual effect of the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance. By force of circumstances each government, even against its own wish, will be compelled to wink at the predatory policies of the other; and the tendency will be to create a division of spheres of influence between the north and south in order to avoid more direct conflicts. The English liberals who stand for the renewal of the alliance on the ground that it will enable England to exercise a check on Japanese policies, are more naive than was Mr. Wilson with his belief in the separation of the economic and political control of Shantung.

It cannot be too often repeated that the real point of friction between the United States and Japan is not in California but in China. It is silly —unless it is calculated—for English authorities to keep repeating that under no circumstances does

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the alliance mean that Great Britain would support Japan in a war with the United States. The day the alliance is renewed, the hands of the militarists in Japan will be strengthened and the hands of the liberals—already weak enough—be still further weakened. In consequence, all the sources of friction in China between the United States and Japan will be intensified. I do not believe in the predicted war. But should it come, the first act of Japan—so everyone in China believes—will be to seize the ports of northern China and its railways in order to make sure of an uninterrupted supply of food and raw materials. The act would be justified as necessary to national existence. Great Britain in alliance with Japan would be in no position to protest in anything but the most perfunctory way. The guarantee of such abstinence would be for Japan the next best thing to open naval and financial support. Without the guarantee they would not dare the seizure of Chinese ports. In recent years diplomatists have shown themselves capable of unlimited stupidity. But it is not possible that the men in the British Foreign Office are not aware of these elementary facts. If they renew the alliance they knowingly take the responsibility for the consequences.

JOHN DEWEY.

Peking, May 24.

The Case of Anita Whitney

IN the fall of 1919, after the separation of the left wing from the old Socialist party, the state branch of the Communist Labor party was organized in Oakland, California, and on the executive committee was Charlotte Anita Whitney, a native Californian with generations of American ancestry behind her. Immediately afterward, warrants were issued for the arrest of all the members of this committee under the Criminal Syndicalism law. The persecution of radicals, and the suppression of speech and press have been and still are especially fierce in Oakland where the movement has been most alive, and therefore the local prosecutor took up the case relentlessly, with varying results, against the local members, while the warrants for those outside of Oakland and San Francisco were not served.

For some reason, Miss Whitney also escaped for the moment, perhaps because she was the only woman, and the mere threat of arrest might serve to frighten her into silence. Probably, however, the real reason was Anita Whitney's social prominence and universal popularity. She is known throughout the state and indeed beyond it, for her life-long devotion to all progressive and humane causes. Her record for social service especially is of tremendous import. It was through her work in this field that she was led into the radical movement as the only hopeful activity leading to the fundamental betterment of the unspeakable conditions which she found among the pathetic people she was giving her life to help. And the work she was doing was not the result of an intellectual conviction only and of a conscientious desire to live up to it, but of a passionate need to throw herself into the struggle for bringing about this fundamental freedom of the masses from exploitation, poverty, disease and degeneration.

And so if the authorities believed she could be terrorized into inactivity, they did not know the spirit of Anita Whitney. Calmly and as a matter, of course, she continued her radical work, whenever and wherever the opportunity offered. In November, she was invited to address the Oakland Civic Centre on the Negro problem. This invitation speaks for the tolerance and sanity of the majority membership of the club, and for the personal popularity of Miss Whitney, for she had been conspicuous as a determined opponent of the war and as an uncompromising Red. It is remarkable that so conservative a body of women in Oakland should have been willing to allow her to speak to them on any subject whatsoever. The minority, it proved, were not, and a very dramatic struggle took place. Protests were made by "patriotic" organizations including the American Legion. Judge Lynch, (for so he has the misfortune really to be named,) was appealed to, and he said there would not be interference as long as the speaker indulged in no disloyal or seditious utterances. The police and commissioner of public safety took the same position. Police Inspector Fenton Thompson, however, appeared before the club and appealed to the members to refuse Miss Whitney the platform on the ground that she was an extreme radical, and had acted on the defence committee of the I. W. W. There was a stormy and dramatic debate within the crowded auditorium, while the corridor outside was packed with excited women who struggled with each other for admittance.

Meanwhile, Miss Whitney, with no thought of withdrawing, although she had been warned that the old charge would be pressed should she appear —it was well-understood that she would present the Negro problem from the radical point of view—serenely, meanwhile, Miss Whitney waited outside the hall for an hour and a half, when to the everlasting credit of the Civic Centre majority, permission was voted for her to address the Club. Immediately on conclusion of her address, she was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arrested on the old charge of "criminal syndicalism,"—no hint of a new offense;—Anita Whitney must be silenced on any pretence. She has given an account in a recent issue of the Survey of her eleven days' confinement in the Oakland County jail,—an experience which might easily have induced a weaker woman to capitulate; but nothing from her own pen could (or would) convey to her readers anything of the wonderful spirit which has carried her through all these years of service,—service which to others would have seemed sacrifice, but which to her has meant living and the joy of living. Only her fellow-workers and her friends can know and appreciate this strong sweet spirit.

She was tried, convicted and sentenced to from one to fourteen years in San Quentin Penitentiary where her old friend and co-worker Dr. Marie Equi is already serving a term on similar charges. Midway in the trial, her lawyer died, but no postponement was granted during his illness. On the testimony of physicians, she was admitted to bail. As her own property was tied up as bail for I. W. W.'s and other radicals, some of the most conservative and substantial citizens came forward as her bondsmen,—old family friends. Miss Whitney has appealed the case, and she and her friends are now anxiously awaiting the postponed decision.

"I hoped it would never come to this," she has said smilingly, "but I could not have done differently. The path was straight before me and I walked it. That was all. There was no other way."

Serenely still she continues her radical work,—on the defence committee, in the Irish freedom league, on the radical labor weekly the Rank and File, and wherever her services are needed in the cause of freedom for humanity.

ANNA PORTER.

A Day of Summer

Contentedly a cricket sings and sings,
And cattle stand knee-deep in Fallon Brook
Dreaming, with mild and liquid eyes that look
On distance, unconcerned of present things.
The sun wheels over. Guiltily Time brings
Back to us part of what last Summer took—
A leaf restored, once torn from the bright book
Wherein we read of tears and leave-takings.

Rome burns again—a sullen fire that fills
The West with many beacons: towers of brass,
And crimsoned altars low among the hills
Where miracles of evening come to pass. . . .
Who can be homeless? Who can wish tonight
For tapestries and halls and candlelight?

LESLIE NELSON JENNINGS.

The American Invasion of England

OF course the Americans are only part of the great invasion of England which gloomy people here speak of as a "menace," as though it were not primarily a cause for modest pride. The Australians came seeking our cricket scalps, hard men and in-fighters, led by a giant called Armstrong, two hundred and fifty pounds in weight, amiable in temper though ferocious of mien and, what is more important, horribly well equipped as batsman, bowler and tactician-in-chief. The lawn-tennis tournament at Wimbledon and the Davis Cup bring us a medley of the nations. But the principal invaders, the real enemy in everything but cricket, are the Americans. They have recovered the Polo Cup. Polo, by the way, is a rich man's game which the pure idea of rivalry with America is converting daily into a popular sport. A bare handful of people in the country play it, not one in a thousand has seen the game nor knows except vaguely how it is played, but let the Americans come over to "lift" something that we have got and national sentiment raises its multitudinous head. The press gets busy, the special correspondents seize their fluent pens, and if the polo Tests could have been played where the proletariat lives instead of at the ancient and exclusive Hurlingham, the proletariat would have flocked to watch the game as though it played on its own ponies every Saturday afternoon. And a fine spectacle for it too, this interplay of fierce, impetuous movement of both man and beast on a field more spacious than most other games demand.

The conservatism of the English comes out nowhere so clearly as in its games. It is true that they play Rugby football uncommonly well but even there their forward play is commonly marked by hard, untiring labor rather than by the fierce sweep and passion of the traditional Scottish and Irish rushes. Every people reveals its temperament in its games. The Frenchman, who cares nothing for the Association football game (which forbids the handling of the ball) has taken with enormous verve and energy to the Rugby code with its rapid thinking and swift impetuosities of action. (The Welshman's inclination is the same.) In the more patient, stolid Germany before the war "Soccer," as the Association game is called for short, was spreading rapidly. But the characteristic English game is cricket, with its inimitable mixture of patience and of daring, sticking-it-out and bold improvization.

The affection of the English crowd for cricket seems to puzzle many Americans as that of Americans for baseball bewilders some Englishmen. I remember once reading of an American who declared that business men in great English cities shut their offices and hurried off to a county cricket ground if they heard that some batsman could not be got out, whereas, he said, the only thing that would attract an American was news of terrific hitting or the catastrophic fall of wickets. Here in England the bowler who sends down maiden after maiden—a maiden over is one from which no runs are made—earns a meed of praise from both the crowd and the experts of the press. Armstrong, they note, in one great match bowled twenty-four maidens out of fifty-two overs. One hundred and forty-four balls and not a run hit off them—good man, good man indeed! So with lawn ten-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nis, too. The English way has been, and still predominantly is, the base-line game, which means the art of not losing points by dint of sober accuracy and persistent good length.

The American temperament runs to very different tactics. It makes for speed, activity, decision. Said Napoleon, "Activité, activité, vitesse!" So say the Americans and they have developed baseball to satisfy their bent and, after baseball, the modern tactic of lawn-tennis with its insistence on volleying, on getting to the net, even—as was said of the tempestuous McLoughlin—on making every stroke a winner.

In justice to the American game, it should be said that this tactic is not wholly, though it is largely, a matter of temperament; it is based also on the reasoned conviction, which is thoroughly sound, that the speed and thrust of the volleying game is the best method of attack and the road to victory. In justice to the English game it should be added that the American view is now widely accepted in England and will probably be carried out by the rising generation of players—if there is really a rising generation of note—but the English insistence on sound base-line play as the foundation of good tennis remains and will remain. It is in the blood. What, by the way, would Americans say to an episode which happened the other day in a round of the Davis Cup competition in London, when F. G. Lowe, a British representative and chief of base-liners, played a rally of not less than fifty-six strokes against his Spanish opponent? Twenty-eight strokes from each side, base-line to base-line, and never a decision till the fifty-sixth of all! "Activité, vitesse," said the master; find the weak point of the enemy and fall on it with all your strength. No, there is nothing Napoleonic about the base-line game.

Because the game natural and congenial to the American is one of rapid movement and decision, we are entitled to a sense of grievance against American excellence in golf. For no one can say that those are the distinctive attributes of golf. At the first blush, the sober Englishman and the dour Scot really ought to be better at golf than their American brother, and if they are not clearly so, it follows that the American temperament must include some quality necessary to good golf that is separate from those that have developed first-rate excellence in polo, baseball, and lawn tennis. So indeed it does. The quality is concentration. No game more jealously than golf demands the concentration of the faculties and the perfect control of limbs and muscles by the directing will.

Concentration is American. There never was a people, which, if it may be said with respect, concentrated so ferociously on a sport, when it had once made its mind up that the sport was worth attention. The organization of athletics in the United States for the Olympic Games has no parallel in this country and neither has the elaborate system by which, as described in Mr. Tilden's recent book, the United States is divided into districts and district championships for the purpose of fostering young talent at lawn-tennis and discovering the most formidable boy-player of the country. All the efforts in England to arouse a strong popular interest in the organization and training of an English team for the Olympic Games have been a failure. Lawn-tennis is not organized at all with a view to national competitions and scarcely can it be said to be taught; it is very widely played and is growing steadily in popularity but there is little or no coaching, organizing or regimenting of it. There is, in fact, no sport in England that receives the exhaustive care and concentration that seems so common in America, except rowing at Oxford and Cambridge. Every now and then a feeble voice is heard demanding a regime more serious and business-like. Recently there was a "movement" for collecting a cricket Test Match team and making it play together assiduously before meeting the Australians. But the movement did not move. People just did not think the thing worth while.

This seems to be a fundamental difference between the American and the English view of sports. It is a difference which will, I think, give most of the prizes of the world's sports in time to the Americans, with the British Dominions coming next and the British of the home countries from time to time sending up brilliant men like the Doherty's at lawn-tennis who for the time will sweep the field.

The Dominions will without doubt always be to the front because with their splendid climates (compare also California and its tennis players), their open-air and comparatively adventurous lives, their high vitality, initiative and independence they have an astonishingly high degree of physical excellence, and sometimes, as in the case of New Zealand Rugby football, they organize with enormous care and skill. The Americans have the aptitude also, the physical vigor and the enthusiasm. They have, besides, a great population and the determination in any international sport to which they set their mind to mobilize their resources until their representatives are the best that the nation by taking thought can produce in the field of competition. Other countries will produce their champions from time to time. In sports like golf we shall hold our own much more tenaciously than we have done in lawn-tennis. In track-athletics, the sprints will go to America, but at the medium distances we shall come out on top, while the heavy "field events" will be won by the splendid Scandinavians and Finns. But by and large, and over a long period of time, I think, the championships in many international sports will fall most often to the Americans. We in England are more happy-go-lucky and we still (though sometimes with little reason) like to think and talk of the spirit of the village green. In competition for championships we shall pay the penalty. But every people to its taste.

W. P. Crozier.

Squirrel

Is the difference
  between the creature
  who wants all men,
and the lady
  who wants one man
  to be all,
sufficient to warrant
  the slant-eyed term
  applied to the former,
and the distinctive
  conferred on the latter?
is the conundrum
  put by his chatter
  running round the cage
  without a door.

Alfred Kreymborg.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A COMMUNICATION

The Case for the Bonus

SIR: When any group of Americans set up for themselves in the business of asking something from Congress, they find that in union there is a certain strength, but also a positive weakness, because a strong, united minority of the body politic, although opposed by only another minority, may by its very strength alienate the sympathy of the vast unorganized, and usually uninterested, majority. The labor unions have encountered this trouble. It seriously pains one of us common people who gets four dollars a day to observe another common fellow next door, by organized effort or demand, get away with five. We know he is no better than ourselves, and consequently we are more jealous of his extra dollar than of a hundred which our mutual boss, the capitalist who lives on the hill, is quietly pocketing.

The ex-soldiers of the World War are likely to find themselves in this sort of unhappy disfavor with the great American public, unless they stop their continuous and fairly well organized demand for adjusted service pay, or in plain language, a bonus. And by skilful use of careful misrepresentation, and of such terms as "indiscriminate bonus," "promiscuous bonus," "raid on the treasury" and the like, the interests most definitely opposed to the claim of the veterans are gradually but certainly arousing that sense of jealousy which, when it becomes a majority idea, is known as "aroused public opinion."

How has it come to pass that our heroes of two years ago are beginning to be looked upon as looters of the public purse? As such the editorialists of many of our "leading" newspapers have labelled them. Have they truly stooped so low? Has the patriotic doughboy of song and glory gone plumb to pot? Or is his present case defensible? Is there an honest case for the soldiers' bonus?

Briefly, the ex-service man says that while he fought the war and won it, he was underpaid. The man who stayed at home, either as capitalist or laborer, was enormously overpaid according to all previous standards. The service man now asks the government, which paid both, to adjust the matter by giving to the service man a retroactive increase in pay, an adjustment of compensation, a bonus. He says it is unfair for him to have endured the hardships of the campaign, and to suffer a severe economic setback as a consequence. So he asks Congress to give him a bonus, which would of course, be paid in one form or another, sooner or later, largely by the fellow who stayed at home.

To this request, which is sometimes voiced as a demand, Congress answered by passing the Fordney bill through the lower House last spring. Twelve of the separate states answered by voting modest sums as bonuses to the veterans from those states, five of the votes being by popular referendum. The business interests which are threatened with more direct taxation, especially under the Fordney bill, have answered by a fast spreading propaganda that the soldiers are "prostituting patriotism for pay," "demanding indiscriminate bonuses," "raiding the Treasury" and even "threatening to bankrupt the country." Their most insidious allegation is that the payment of the bonus would, in some way, lessen the ability or intention of the government to take care of the wounded and the disabled of the war.

It is needless to discuss the details of the Fordney bill in a mere effort to arrive at the right or wrong of the soldiers' bonus. That bill provides five optional forms of adjusted service pay. One form—a cash payment—might as well be considered, since cash would pay for the others, land, insurance, education, etc. The bill provides six special forms of taxation to pay the bonus. There might as well be one, or a hundred, so far as the right or wrong of the payment is concerned.

Also we may fairly admit that if a bonus is a right and just claim, it must necessarily be "indiscriminate," in so far as that means that it must be paid to each and every veteran, according to the period of his service. If it is fair and just, it is no more a "raid on the treasury" than the two hundred and forty dollars a year bonus allowed all government employees during the war (and still in force), or the guaranteed profits allowed the railroads, or the bonus to ship builders for speedy fulfillment of contracts, or to shipyard labor, or the cost plus ten per cent to contractors.

Of the fairness and justice of the bonus, let us consider but one or two simple cases, eliminating the extreme story of the returned veteran with the sick wife and the mortgage on the old farm, and talking about every day people. Major Joseph Caccavajo, late of the General Staff A. E. F., whose rank leaves him out as a possible beneficiary of the bonus, but whose sympathy and activity has been for the bonus, explains the matter by recalling that it was he, personally, who recruited some 2,000 men for service with a certain regiment of engineers. To secure these men, he went into the railroad shops and similar plants, made brief speeches, aroused the patriotic enthusiasm of the best men in the plants, and signed them up.

These men donned the uniform, went to France, and served through the war at pay averaging nominally about one dollar a day, but actually, with insurance, allotments, Liberty bond payments etc. deducted, averaging less than fifty cents.

Other men stayed in those shops, where in fact most of them were ultimately listed as necessary war labor, and exempted from the draft. Throughout the war they earned higher wages than had ever been known before. Many received special bonuses. Whether they bought homes, or automobiles, or squandered the money, is immaterial. They got it. The men in France, coupling longer hours, harder work, various hardships and the danger of battle, didn't get it. And these men came back in many cases to find jobs hard to get, promotion passed over them in the interim, prices shot sky high and—well you know the story.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"These men suffered a severe economic disadvantage by reason of their military service," says Major Caccavajo. "Proud as I am to have helped recruit them to the national service, I cannot honestly rest idle while there is any power in me to help them overcome the disadvantage which their service cost them. A bonus to those men, and millions like them, is fair and just. I am going to work for it in every way I know how."

There, trimmed of much discussion about it, is the case for the bonus. It is a just and a fair claim, or it is not. In every case where the voters have passed on the question, they have held it fair and just. That the fight against it has centred in Wall Street is perhaps not due so much to the inherent wickedness presumed to abide in that narrow highway, as to the unlucky fact that the Ways and Means Committee of Congress last May playfully tucked a special tax on stock and bond sales into the Fordney bill. Naturally stock brokers do not care to be taxed out of business, or even out of profits. It is obviously unfair to permit that or any other single scheme of taxation to determine the merits of the bonus.

Of the final, and to many minds the most vicious and unfair argument against the bonus, namely that it would imperil the welfare of the disabled, there is little to be said in all seriousness, because it is so baseless that its proponents never argue it at any length. If they can merely project it as an idea, and let it go unanswered, its work is done. Those heartless veterans would take the very sheets off the hospital beds to help their selfish purpose.

But how, precisely, does adjusted service pay affect the hospitalization or compensation of the disabled? The answer is—not in any possible way whatsoever. The government has already fully acknowledged its obligation to the wounded. True, it has not completely met that obligation, but it has agreed to meet it, and is doing so regularly and with increasing amplitude. Every reasonable law requested for the disabled has been passed. Appropriations to care for them are now included in the national budget as matters of routine. There is no question about the care of the disabled. It is an established fact.

Two clever ex-officers, operating in New York City, last spring conceived a Committee for the Aid of the Disabled and for a Referendum on the Bonus. They raised funds from reputable people, using the name of the American Legion without authority, to conduct a fight against the bonus, in the name of the disabled. The Legion promptly denounced the scheme, so far as its good name was involved. The entire scheme, with a list of the donators, was exposed completely in one veterans' newspaper, the Stars and Stripes. Many of the donors explained that they had believed they were giving to aid the disabled. The funds were used for propaganda against the bonus. The New York Times, possibly deceived, loaned its columns freely to the schemers. Once exposed, their plan was abandoned, and the remaining funds given to a reorganized committee which actually used them, or some of them, in aid of the men in hospitals.

This despicable piece of work, which sought to involve the bonus case with that of the wounded, met with failure, but the seed which was then sown, and which newspapers like the Times helped to nourish, has many upshoots today throughout the country. The least defensible argument against the bonus, it is becoming the most widespread. But the bitterness which it has aroused may well be overlooked, if the public which makes the final judgment can come to look at the veterans' claim in an unbiassed light.

Either the soldiers' bonus is a fair and just claim upon the government which they served, or it is nothing. As charity, as a reward for patriotism, as a "promiscuous handout," it is not asked and certainly should not be paid. In considering whether or not it is a proper claim, the public is entitled to the simple facts, unencumbered by prejudicial falsehoods. With the facts unvarnished, the veterans may well rest their case before the court of American opinion.

RICHARD SEELYE JONES.

New York City.

CORRESPONDENCE

Official Policy in the New Roumania

SIR: In your issue of June 22nd your contributor, Mr. M. E. Ravage, speaks of a "barbarous tendency to flagellation" in the new Roumania, implying that such tendency is characteristic of Roumanian governmental methods. I wish to protest against this implication as a dangerous and wholly unfair generalization, unwarranted by the facts of the case.

It is no more adequate to speak of "a barbarous tendency to flagellation" as a matter of official Roumanian policy than it would be to assume a tendency to lynching as an attribute of official American policy.

There have been single transgressions of overzealous petty officials, to be explained, if not excused, by the senseless, provoking attitude of certain Magyar irreconcilables and by the generally strained and militant atmosphere; but such transgressions are frowned upon by a government intent on racial reconciliation and internal consolidation.

Your contributor, who apparently aims at all-around fairness, and deplores the nationalistic psychosis, might have done well in pointing out that the Magyar working class and peasant population suffer a great deal more under the present militarist and imperialist government in Hungary proper, than in Roumania, or other succession states.

This you may verify from the testimony of the best Magyar liberal leaders themselves, now exiles from their native land.

ANTOINE BIBESCO,
Roumanian Minister.

Washington, D. C.

M. D.'s at Annapolis?

SIR: Your editorial comment on President Harding's recent speech to the Annapolis graduates, compares them to young journalists whose "chief expressed the hope that they might never be forced to dip their pens into their ink." Why not instead compare them to budding M.D.'s whose "chief" might very well wish for them in his commencement address, that they would never be called upon to amputate a leg nor to remove a gall-bladder? If President Harding or anybody else could persuade naval officers into the doctor's attitude towards their profession, we might hope eventually for a science of "preventive warfare" analogous to the science of preventive medicine.

HELEN TREDWAY GRAHAM.

Saint Louis, Missouri.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Things

AT my time of life I ought to be old enough to expect nothing from controversies involving definitions of abstract words, and nothing conclusive, as it happens, is just what I do expect. Yet I cannot help watching such controversies. There is an agreeable contrast between one's certainty that they won't amount to anything and one's furtive hope that they may.

A case not quite in point is a controversy occasioned by the exhibition, at the Leicester Galleries in London, of Mr. Max Beerbohm's newest caricatures. On May 18th the English labor paper, the Daily Herald, published an article about this exhibition by J. Q. X., who said, among other things: "Vulgar is precisely the word for at least one of the caricatures. . . . Of course, it is funny, too. A creature of swinish countenance, called a Labour Minister of Education, is saying to a poet: 'Wot! You'll dedicate your mon-you-mental translation of Pett Rark's sonnets to me if I'll get you out-door relief for six months? Oh, really? And you say *you're* one of the workers yourself? Worker? Blackmailer—that's what *you* are! . . . Outside!' For such transmission (even through technically refined art) of the prejudice of intellectual snobbery, vulgar is the only word."

In a letter dated Villino Chiaro, Rappallo, Italy, May 21st, and addressed to the editor of the Daily Herald, Mr. Beerbohm made this reply to his critic: "This morning, as I sat in an attitude of the utmost refinement, surveying that restrained sea, the Mediterranean, my attention was drawn to a criticism written by J. Q. X. and published in your issue of May 18, accusing me of having been guilty of vulgarity in a prophetic drawing of a Labour Minister of Education scoffing at a penurious poet who, declaring himself a 'worker,' has applied to him for aid.

"I am not, Sir, a young man; and my work has in the course of years met with a certain amount of adverse criticism. But never till now have I been called vulgar. It has been reserved for J. Q. X. to call me that. And I must say I find the epithet immensely refreshing—all the more so because it is not undeserved. The drawing in question *is* distinctly vulgar, and so is my inscription on it.

"Vulgarity has its uses. Vulgarity often cuts ice which refinement scrapes at vainly. And I like to think that some of the Labour leaders who have read J. Q. X.'s account of my shocking little drawing will visit the Leicester Galleries and be shocked themselves—shocked even into realising, as they do not yet seem to have realised, that the well-being of skilled and unskilled manual workers is not quite all that matters. Yours obediently, Max Beerbohm."

The latest contribution I have seen to the controversy is "An Open Letter to Max" from Mr. Gerald Gould, literary editor of the Daily Herald. Mr. Gould, who denies that Labor's ideals are "restricted to the betterment of its own material lot," reminds Mr. Beerbohm that even if they were, "those who live in Italian villas should not throw stones at those who live in slums and hovels. There are you, with Oxford behind you and an eternity of fame before you," Mr. Gould continues, "and here are the miners, starving and seeing their children starve, in the attempt to prevent themselves from being beaten down to a weekly wage of the purchasing power of something less than twenty-five pre-war shillings. . . . Do you think your caricatures will help or hinder the miners in this struggle?"

"And do you think," Mr. Gould asks Mr. Beerbohm, "do you think working-men *wilfully* deny themselves the culture by which you set such store? You would be surprised at the proportion of miners' time and wages that ordinarily goes in books and music; and they would spend more in those ways if they had more to spend. Is it not obvious that any one, given the choice, would rather have *your* life than sweat and ache in the darkness and danger of a mine?"

The last paragraph in Mr. Gould's letter is this: "In one of your caricatures you sneer at a hypothetical Labour Foreign Secretary for pluming himself on having discovered that Paris is 'pronounced Paree.' It so happens—it is a mere chance—that I can think offhand of two Labour leaders who speak French with perfect correctness and fluency—far better than, as I gather from your published works, you speak it yourself. But suppose it were not so. Suppose no Labour leader had had the chance of learning how any foreign word was pronounced. Is a difference of accent, which, after all, is only a difference of opportunity, a thing for a gentleman to sneer at? You are more than a gentleman: you are a great man. Is this worthy of you?"

Here we have a kind of controversy that is inconclusive and worth reading. Although it more or less turns upon the meaning of an abstract word, vulgarity, none of the controversialists has tried either to define vulgarity or to leave upon his readers the impression that he alone has consistently stuck to the only correct definition, his own. Neither Mr. Gould nor Mr. Beerbohm nor J. Q. X. sees controversy as a game in which being right is more important than being anything else, than being anything at all. Each is content to look at things from his own point of view, and to report them as they appear to his natural and fallible self. None of the three has committed the sin of inerrancy.

It is with Mr. Gerald Gould's point of view that I am for the moment concerned. His letter is a good example of party spirit when party spirit remains as generous as it can ever remain without ceasing to be party spirit. Perhaps that is why it puzzles me. It lays down rules which would greatly restrict the caricaturist's liberty. Don't caricature a class without taking note of its exceptional members. Don't caricature anybody who has on his hands a fight that you wish him to win. Don't caricature anybody whose life is less fortunate than your own. Such rules as these leave me wondering how Mr. Gould would have a caricaturist set about his business when any member of the laboring class is his subject. As things are at present most wage-earners cannot help living a life which tends to give them the appearance and the degree of cultivation which Mr. Beerbohm has caricatured in his drawing of the Poet and the Labor Minister of Education. This truth and its implications make one of the strongest arguments for such changes as will open the door for all wage-earners to a happier life. Can a caricaturist strengthen this argument by ignoring this truth? Or should he perhaps, regarding Labor as privileged by its lack of opportunity, let Labor alone?

For my part, although I feel with Mr. Gould a distaste for caricature of the under dog, I must own myself puzzled when I think of the exclusions into which a logical pursuit of this distaste would lead me. Shall no caricaturist ever draw a picture of anybody whose life is less fortunate than his own? Is the caricaturist whose prosperity is on the increase to see himself shut out of field after field?

P. L.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After the Play

ALL I remember of The Egoist, since I read it at sixteen, is much confusing discourse about a leg. George Meredith took hold of Sir Willoughby's leg and pulled it as if it were irresistibly funny. Perhaps it was. But not at sixteen. Reading Meredith at that age was like chewing wine-glasses or wearing a shirt made of tin. The word Egoist in itself puzzled one so much that I lost a year's growth.

Yet I wish a great leg-puller like Meredith could pull the leg of the Broadway leg-show. Given a certain freedom of discourse, something might be made of the name. The leg-show! An obscene name, really. Think of the sniffing male who found the name for it, and who depersonalized the chorus-girl until she was nothing but a —leg. Sometimes I have gone to swim in this public soup of sensuality, with all the other tired business men. But if one's attention ever mounted from the leg to the choral face, what a jolt to sensuality. The lady of the leg was either smiling in a manner which totally disproved the James-Lange theory that emotions follow contortions, or else she was revealing a jaded, sagging, dull attitude toward life in general and musical comedy in particular. A worse watch-the-clock wage-slave than the average second and third-row chorus girl would be impossible to see. Having gazed much at these exanimate objects, ornately dressed and frowzily painted, I have sought faces elsewhere —also legs.

Why, then, does one persist in liking musical comedy? Well, strangely enough, for the comedy and for the music. One enjoys the feeling that here, at any rate, someone who has been amused by life is going to pass it on, to give himself freely. If one wants to see an assemblage of good-looking girls, attractive and intelligent and prettily clad, one can more reasonably satisfy that polygamous impulse by going to Wanamaker's or Altman's or Macy's. In those places, at least, the young lady can be talked to as well as gazed on, and when she is talked to there comes the end of de-personalization. But the floor-walker, comic enough, does not supply music. For that one must return to the theatre, where, apart altogether from the leg-show, the tradition of musical comedy is still alive.

At its best that tradition is distinctly social and genial. It forgets the ulterior purposes of the theatre—profit—and rejoices in the expression itself. That expression is triumphant when, in a manner thoroughly personal and intimate, the comedian finds his own inwardness and, at the same time, his audience's. To play on the audience is not enough. He must have known such enjoyment that he is himself illuded. Otherwise, slick though he may be, he remains an expensive headliner. He doesn't exist as a comedian. But when he does exist as a comedian, has a creative touch, and falls in with the releasing rhythm of music, he does more for us in giving the sense of pleasant experience than most artists in the theatre. He flies us to gayety.

Well, then, "you must see Shuffle Along!" A dozen people who like musical comedy told me this. They said glowingly, "it's Negro musical comedy," all Negro, performed at the 63rd Street Music Hall, in New York.

What has more possibilities than Negro musical comedy? The Negro brings to this medium everything that makes it delightful. Nobody has his sense of rhythm. Nobody can laugh quite like him, or slide so easily from laughter to tears. Nobody can give himself so completely. When a Negro is freely himself, his friendly and gentle self, he has a perfect good taste that keeps him from forced fun and stridency. He is not restrained, but finds full release in a rollicking and fantastic invention. He has a sense of absurdity, of grotesqueness, that nothing can shame. And yet, while he laughs so broadly, so openly, he saves himself from the cruelty of laughter by the wealth of his kindness. He whom the world has brayed in its mortar looks with knowing humor at the world.

Some of this charm, I venture to say, is lost in Shuffle Along. In two ways the white world has prevented the black sense of comedy. Broadway has misled the Negro chorus girls into displaying chiffon and silk (a device, originally to make American wives accompany their husbands to musical shows). Broadway has also misled the Negro tenor into rhyming mammy and Alabammy, into warbling of his honey and the pickaninnies and all the other stock-in-trade of the music shop. (Hasn't Izzy Seigel just written My Old Irish Mother, I'm Remembering You?) But slavish as are many of the items in Shuffle Along, none is so disgusting as the desire to amuse the white audience by seeing the Negro as the whites see him. No burnt-cork comedian ever went so far in ridiculing the illiteracy, the thievery, the political imbecility of colored folk. The touch here is gross and slavish. It is too heavy, too uninventive, to be sincere.

But when the imitations and simulations of Broadway are forgotten—with their tinge of sentimentality, vulgarity and brutality—one finds the best of musical comedy in Shuffle Along. In dancing, in singing, in such incidents as the boxing match and the entrance of the mayor, there is that extraordinary sense of gayety and release which comes only from the real thing. As mayor Mr. F. E. Miller is bound to be compared to Bert Williams. He employs the same lurching, shuffling walk. He has the same height and looseness of build. But traditional as this is, and traditional as it is for his vis-à-vis, Mr. Aubrey Lyles, to be short and crisp, the effect in general is decidedly their own, and when they employ it as in their boxing-match to music —with Lyles pirouetting frantically and helplessly under the tremendous reach of Miller—you have delicious parody. So in Mr. Miller's imperial gestures as newly elected mayor of Jimtown. His humor here is as deep as all human self-importance. That it hits at a Negro's self-importance is all the more true and legitimate. It is only when illiteracy is strummed so often in the same way that one resents having the Negro the butt of it. Negro illiteracy in itself is fair game.

In barbarous white and red, or in gingham, the chorus gave an effect far more characteristic and amusing than the effect in grand department-store cloaks and gowns. But to transport the Negro chorus into the region where it could be most brilliantly used, and with the highest results of comedy for the principals, calls for a creativeness not present in Shuffle Along. What is to be found there, sometimes wholly unspoiled, is the freshness of the Negro spirit, its love of color and lilt, its cadence and melody, its unhampered enjoyment of the strutting human scene.

F. H.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roads to Einstein

Relativity, The Special and General Theory, a Popular Exposition by Albert Einstein. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

From Newton to Einstein, by B. Harrow. New York: Van Nostrand Co.

Easy Lessons in Einstein, by E. E. Slosson. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

Space, Time and Gravitation, by A. S. Eddington. New York: Cambridge University Press.

The Einstein Theory of Relativity, by H. A. Lorentz. New York: Brentano's.

Space and Time in Contemporary Physics, by M. Schlick. New York: Oxford University Press.

The Foundations of Einstein's Theory of Gravitation, by E. Freundlich. New York: Cambridge University Press.

The General Principle of Relativity in its Philosophic and Historical Aspect, by H. W. Carr. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Space, Time and Deity, by S. Alexander. New York: The Macmillan Co.

An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Natural Knowledge, by A. N. Whitehead. New York: Cambridge University Press.

The Concept of Nature, by A. N. Whitehead. New York: Cambridge University Press.

THE publication of all these books, besides the numerous newspaper and magazine articles addressed to the general public, is an impressive testimony of the extent to which cosmic problems still solicit the human mind. Doubtless a great deal of the popular interest in the theory of relativity is temporary and somewhat meretricious. The irresponsible assertion that there are twelve men who understand the fantastic newspaper accounts of it has doubtless served to add to the fascination which the unintelligible always exercises on men's minds, much as forbidden fruit stimulates desire. But behind this there is certainly a great deal of genuine rational curiosity. Despite the insistence of intellectual mediocrity that the proper study of mankind is man, nothing is of such truly human interest as the nature of the physical world in which we live. Moreover, to gain a genuinely new fundamental idea such as is involved in the theory of relativity is an experience akin to that which comes in the highest creative art or religion—a liberation from the dead complacency of the accepted views and an enlargement of our being by an enlarged vision of new possibilities.

Can this new insight into the structure of our physical world be brought home to the general public? The answer depends not only on the expositor but also on the previous training and present intellectual zeal of the reader. A thorough technical mastery of Einstein's theory of gravitation requires a knowledge of new branches of higher mathematics; but the fundamental principles are all simple enough, and Einstein himself states them in his book with masterly clarity. It is folly, however, to expect that his modification of the older theories should be clear to those —a greater multitude than is generally admitted—who have no true idea as to what are the fundamental principles of the older Galileo-Newtonian mechanics. There is no royal road in science, not even for King Demos. Even with the best guides, the hill of vision is steep and rocky. It also takes time before the eye can become adjusted to the new and more sweeping views. But if the king is tired or impatient and wants to be entertained, let him call the court jesters, the movies and the short-story magazines.

Of the different books under review Dr. Harrow's is probably the easiest for the utterly uninitiated to read through. It introduces the stranger to the general field where the theory of relativity is situated, but it does not get him very close to the meaning of the principle of relativity itself. Moreover, the information at the author's disposal is not always reliable, e. g., when he quotes from an article by the present reviewer without correcting a glaring error in it or noticing that the relativity therein referred to is the older Newtonian relativity.

Dr. Slosson's book is equally modest in its pretensions but shows more knowledge of the subject and is more skilful in introducing pleasant and diverting illustrations. But the skill, alas, is also used to make us avoid direct contact with the things that make the theory of relativity really worth while.

Professor Eddington's book is a more systematic treatise addressed to readers who, though without technical knowledge of the subject, are willing to learn and are not scared by a few mathematical symbols. Professor Eddington is the foremost English expounder of Einstein, and it was his report that first introduced Einstein's theory of gravitation to the British public at a time when America was cut off from German publications by the blockade. But though it is based on a thorough mastery of the mathematics of the subject, and written with a great deal of verve, the book suffers from a certain systematic unclearness as to fundamentals. There is no very clear distinction between mathematical analogies and physical identities. This is well illustrated in the use of the term "curvature of space." Thus, also, the shortening of distances and the slowing up of clocks in moving systems are spoken of sometimes as physical facts (in the manner of Lorentz and Fitzgerald) and sometimes as mathematical consequences of our conventions as to measurements (which is Einstein's contribution to the subject). Obviously these two different conceptions cannot be true at the same time. Professor Eddington also confuses physical relativity, the relativity of physical measurements to each other, with the entirely different issue of the relativity of physical occurrences to a human mind.

The newspaper article of Lorentz—it is only in its English translation that the publishers have padded it out with miscellaneous additions into a book—is by a master who may rightly be called the author of the electromagnetic theory of relativity. It does one good to note the characteristic generosity of great men of science in the enthusiasm of the older master for the younger man who has improved on his work by a method requiring the fascinating boldness of youth. Unfortunately the standard of foreign newspaper articles on scientific subjects is above that of America and one cannot recommend Lorentz's article to those entirely unacquainted with theoretic physics.

Einstein's own book is a really remarkable achievement in clear exposition. The great masters are generally their own best expounders. For the same quality of mind which makes for great scientific achievement, viz., a faith in simple principles strong enough to master the labyrinth of factual details, is precisely the quality which makes for clarity of exposition. At any rate Einstein's exposition certainly has the supreme merit of always keeping the fundamental principles in the foreground and never losing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sight of the woods for the trees. If any reader after a fair effort cannot grasp the fundamental ideas of this book, he has only his own defective education to blame. This, however, does not mean that the book offers no difficulties to one who wishes to master the new theory of relativity. But the main difficulties will be found to be due not to any obscurity in the new ideas but rather to the inertia of the older ideas which persist even after we have learned that they are not logically necessary. For our ideas are mental habits and it requires training or habituation as well as understanding to change them. The reader who understands that numbers may be written in a system where the unit is 12 rather than 10, will be surprised at the number of natural errors he will fall into when he begins to calculate in a duodecimal system. We have the recorded remarks of an English statesman who could see only the most paradoxical results if British coinage were changed to a decimal system. So likewise all the paradoxes which have been so prominent in the popular discussion of the theory of relativity result from unguardedly importing the naive assumptions of the older ideas into the discussion of newer ideas which are inconsistent with them.

The reason for abandoning the old idea of time and space units that are absolute for all possible physical systems is clearly brought out in Schlick's book. Schlick, and even more clearly Freundlich, will also help the reader to realize the newer conception of geometry, not as an a priori science but as a branch of empirical physics. Freundlich's book is also especially clear in its explanation of the newer idea of gravitation. But it is doubtful if even these books can make the conception of the finitude of space perfectly clear to those entirely unfamiliar with the older literature of non-Euclidean geometry.

But the principle obstacle which, I think, troubles lay readers most and which these books do not remove is the difficulty of working oneself into the purely descriptive point of view which is habitual with trained physicists who, like Einstein, have come under the influence of Ernst Mach. The ordinary man knows that when he moves he exerts himself and that his engine or car will not move unless he does something to it. Hence, when he hears the physicist say that rest and motion are relative, and that the motion of a car relative to the earth is the same as the motion of the earth relative to the car, he is completely mystified. Surely we do not set the earth in motion every time that we take a walk or even nod. This difficulty can be removed only by a full realization of the standpoint which physicists call kinematics, which is the point of view of an observer who stands outside of the stream of events and knows nothing of their causes but describes all happenings as accurately as his instrument of measurement will allow. To such an observer motion is not a property of a body but merely a change of distance between one body and others. Such a change of distance is obviously the same whether we say that A moves from B or B moves from A.

When the reader has realized that for the physicist motion is merely the change of distance between objects, he is on the road to understand why Einstein and others feel so strongly that no one body is privileged by nature to be the unique starting point for the measurement of all motion. Common sense and even natural history are interested in particular things and can make them centres of description. But theoretic physics is interested in formulating invariable laws of nature and these laws can not depend on the arbitrary choice of Paris or Berlin as our centres of measurement. Indeed, it may help to eliminate too easily reliance on the word relativity, if we refer to Einstein's theory as one that affirms the absoluteness of the laws of nature for all possible systems of measurement.

In this connection it is important to emphasize that Einstein's procedure involves no hypotheses or theory as to the hidden structure of matter or as to the forces or other agencies behind the veil of phenomena. This procedure, known in the history of physics as the abstractive method is, of course, not Einstein's invention. It has been followed by the greatest physicists from the days of Galileo and Newton to those of Fourier and Willard Gibbs. But in recent times it has been somewhat eclipsed by the triumph of the electron theory which led many to believe that we could through hypotheses as to the structure of the atom reach the ultimate nature of matter. It is the great achievement of Einstein to show that not only may the science of physics be unified but new phenomena may be predicted on the basis of the old abstractive method. The successful prediction of the bending of light rays has been most impressive to the experimental physicists, but to those interested in the general view of the cosmos the unifying effect of the relativity theory on the whole science of physics is of even greater significance. Since the beginning of their science, physicists had been trying in vain to explain the phenomena of electricity and optics on the basis of mechanics, i. e., on the principles of matter and motion. So unsuccessful did these persistent efforts prove, that at the end of the nineteenth century the effort was reversed and attempts made to derive the laws of mechanics from those of electro-magnetism, which had proved so successful in the field of optics. But the phenomena of gravitation proved indigestible to all electro-magnetic theories. It is Einstein's undoubted achievement to have eliminated unbridgeable chasms between the different parts of physics by successfully uniting the laws of gravitation with the laws of motion and showing that Newton's laws of motion and Maxwell's laws of electricity are subject to the same kinematic principles. In this Einstein has had the good sense to guard against any premature synthesis such as has been attempted by some of his more radical followers like Weyl.

Why, in spite of the inevitable and for many quite insurmountable difficulties, should one who is not a technical physicist bother with the theory of relativity? A great many laymen have doubtless been bullied into undertaking a study of it by the assertion that it marks a revolution in the history of mankind as great as that of Copernicus. But all assertions as to the extent of the revolution which the theory of relativity is bound to create have been of the nature of daring prophecy rather than cautious summary of evidence; and prophecy in the intellectual realm is even more hazardous than in the material realm. Certainly the theory of relativity will not immediately affect the price of oil or even bring relief to the sorely harried victims of the war in Europe. But the old and irrepressible questions as to the bourne of time and space which have agitated the human mind at least since the days of Aristotle, Plotinus and St. Augustine have received fresh light. Even if the theory of relativity is definitely refuted by physical tests, which is certainly not impossible, its value as a philosophic stimulant will not have been wiped out.

That the professional philosopher is not as a rule sufficiently in touch with mathematics and physics to realize the philosophic significance of the theory of relativity is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

emphatically illustrated by Professor Carr's book, in which the author's unacquaintance with physics mars not only his account of the recent theories but also of the older physical theories of Descartes and Leibnitz. His fundamental thesis that the theory of relativity demands a Bergsonian philosophy seems to me just a bit of intellectual violence.

Professor Alexander's book is not primarily concerned with the theory of relativity. But his view of time and space which forms the basis of his imposing and carefully elaborated realistic philosophy is in several respects—certainly in the insistence on the interdependence of time and space and on the possibility of many different time-space perspectives of the same world—like the Einstein-Minkowski views. The attempt, however, to represent time and space as the stuff out of which the world is made, belongs to an entirely different set of considerations.

Dr. Whitehead is one of the few living men qualified by the requisite knowledge of mathematics, physics and philosophy to deal adequately with the wider aspects of the theory of relativity. But his two books, though of the highest importance, are certainly not popular reading. In his stupendous attempt to reconstruct the whole framework of the scientific view of nature, he has elaborated a new terminology of his own, and one must read his book several times to be sure of penetrating to his intellectual motives. Still his main contention is in itself clear and illuminating. Instead of endeavoring like Professor Alexander to build up the world out of abstract elements in the manner of traditional philosophy, Whitehead tries to begin rather with the flow of natural events and to invent a system of concepts to fit it. According to his view, the new physics overthrows the old mechanical philosophy so far as the latter believed in material points and instants of time as determining the character of events. The logically unsatisfactory character of the older mechanical views have long been generally recognized. Physicists have known that "points" and "instants" are not facts but logical limits. But in the absence of a workable alternative method the old mechanical view was useful and even indispensable. The theory of relativity suggests new views which make reality consist of a flow of events rather than of hypothetical instants. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of this fact for the social sciences which have always drawn their models of scientific method from the physical sciences. The mechanical method in the social sciences has hitherto led to the systematic ignoring of the category of possibility and hence to a tragically systematic impoverishment of the conception of human nature. But it will require a great deal more development of Dr. Whitehead's compact theses before these points can be made clear to students of social science.

Liberal western civilization, beginning with Greek rationalism, is opposed to the oriental caste distinction between the esoteric and the exoteric. Free civilization means that everyone's reason is competent to explore the facts of nature for himself. But the recent development of science, involving ever greater mastery of complicated technique, means in effect a return to an artificial barrier between the uninitiated layman and the initiated expert. If, therefore, the essence of western civilization is to be preserved, we need not only a higher level of general education but a class of genuine popularizers who will aim not to humor tired minds but to guide man's thirst for knowledge to the sources of its deepest satisfaction.

MORRIS R. COHEN.

Dynamic History

History of The United States, by Charles A. Beard and Mary R. Beard. New York: The Macmillan Co.

THE authors of this text-book believe that in the successive presentations of American history to students in the public schools there is too much repetition in fact and in way of treatment, and this belief leads them to omit from this book much that is usually included; particularly treatment of the period of explorations, biographical sketches of well known heroes, and descriptions of battles and military campaigns. They feel that biographies are amply given in earlier classes and that military descriptions in text-books are too meager to be interesting or helpful.

By these omissions and by others the way is cleared for greater attention upon the recent events in American history. One-fifth of the book is given to the last twenty years, and two-fifths of the book to the period since 1865. Emphasis is placed upon topical rather than narrative treatment, and particular attention is given the economic and social bases of political movements.

The authors have in mind a need quite apart from the traditional place of history in the curriculum. They have in mind, particularly, the need and the outlook of the student in the last year of high school, the last year of schooling for most of them. For they "have aimed to stimulate habits of analysis, comparison, association, reflection and generalization,—habits calculated to enlarge as well as improve the mind. . . . The effectiveness of their citizenship in our republic will be measured by the excellence of their judgment as well as the fullness of their information."

Put this book in the hands of the high school boy who is eager to know more about the meaning of things about him, and particularly of the things he reads in the papers and hears discussed in the peculiarly vapid way common among mature men and women, and he will find much to aid him; for example, the nature of the earlier struggle for a free press, the causes for the widening of the suffrage, the bases of the political parties prior to the Civil War, and, particularly, the chapters on the woman movement and the rise and purposes of organized labor. And for the boy who takes his history, like other studies, as it comes to him, something of the background of the present scene cannot but affect him, for here in a style that glows with honesty and with enthusiasm, we may read of a people that have taken a continent and that have been a refuge to the wanderer. The treatment of the Irish and German immigration is particularly good.

Written for the high school student of seventeen, this history may be read profitably by citizens who have voted for many of the Presidents whose campaigns and administrations are described in the last two hundred and fifty pages. It may surprise some of them to read that Elihu Root is quoted as follows:

> What is the government of this state [New York]? What has it been during the forty years of my acquaintance with it? The government of the Constitution? Oh, no; not half the time or half way. . . . From the days of Fenton and Conkling and Arthur and Cornell and Platt, from the days of David B. Hill down to the present time, the government of the state has presented two different lines of activity: one, of the constitutional and statutory officers of the state and the other of the party leaders; they call them party bosses. They

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

call the system—I don't coin the phrase—the system they call 'invisible government.' For I don't know how many years Mr. Conkling was the supreme ruler in this state. The governor did not count, the legislature did not count, comptrollers and secretaries of state and what not did not count. It was what Mr. Conkling said and in a great outburst of public rage he was pulled down. Then Mr. Platt ruled the state; for nigh upon twenty years he ruled it. It was not the governor, it was not the legislature; it was Mr. Platt. And the capital was not here [in Albany]; it was at 49 Broadway; Mr. Platt and his lieutenants. It makes no difference what name you give, whether you call it Fenton or Conkling or Cornell or Arthur or Platt or by the names of men now living. The ruler of the state during the greater part of the forty years of my acquaintance with the state government has not been any man authorized by the Constitution or by law. . . . The party leader is elected by no one, accountable to no one, bound by no oath of office, removable by no one. E. E. R.

Emerson

Ralph Waldo Emerson: How to Know Him, by Samuel McChord Crothers. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co.

THE volumes in this series, so the publishers declare, are three-fold in scope and embrace an anthology, a biography ("being a brief, authentic, and sympathetic life story"), and a commentary. Unlike the excellent monographs by Mr. Neilson on Burns and by Mr. Sherman on Arnold, this latest addition to the series fails to comply with this three-fold program; the commentary and anthology are not held together by any biographical sketch.

Dr. Crothers's book is made up of a succession of loosely articulated meditations upon various phases of Emerson's thought, interrupted by many excerpts, generally quite brief, from Emersons's writings. The critic is himself too near to Emerson, too much committed by his own profession and environment to a point of view similar to that of Emerson, to accomplish a distinguished, impartial and objective study of the sage. A Bostonian Unitarian clergyman is just the person who should not have been chosen to write this volume; what was needed was a critic whose training and temperament and tastes would have allowed him to stand well out from Emerson, beyond the penumbra cast by that great reputation over much of New England.

Following the tradition in which he is working Dr. Crothers puts aside any attempt at synthesis or system and in a succession of short chapters treats of Emerson's discriminating optimism, his poetry, his transcendentalism, his trust not in the existing order but in the powers residing in the human spirit to triumph over failure. The most nearly robust part of a rather flaccid book is that which deals with Emerson as an intellectual emancipator who, without being a wilful and fanatic destroyer, looked to the future, distrusted conventions, and bade men think for themselves. This is all very well and very valuable; but Emerson the man and the sage is not sharply defined against the background erected by his critic; rather he seems to melt into it, to be enveloped in a faintly luminous haze of mild reproof and benign though rather obvious counsel such as enwraps the figures of those far-off expounders of "wisdom literature" in the Orient to whom Dr. Crothers aptly compares his subject. The light in this book comes from Emerson; there is no turning of light upon him. The result is a dilution of Emersonianism. S. C. C.

Mrs. Sheridan's Book

From Mayfair to Moscow, by Clare Sheridan. New York: Boni & Liveright.

INTERESTED chiefly as a sculptor who wished to model busts of the Soviet leaders, Mrs. Sheridan went to Russia with an engagingly open mind and heart and recorded her impressions in a sprightly, straightforward manner with the impact of strange conditions still fresh upon her. Consequently, the reader feels that, in an unusual degree, he has been given an unbiassed report of a much-distorted subject. Though the diary is fragmentary and in a sense superficial, it provides some basic human evidence. In spite of delays and inconveniences, Mrs. Sheridan apparently enjoyed her adventure to the full, and she sets forth with simplicity and frankness her conversations with Lenin and Trotsky and her estimate of their personalities and of others she met in Moscow or on the way there. She found that life in the requisitioned palace of a sugar king might be extremely diverting in spite of cold baths, coffee-and-black-bread breakfasts, and the necessity sometimes of carrying wood for her own fire. Not the least of the book's charm lies in the glimpses of distinguished men and women, both conservative and radical, whom the author numbers among her acquaintances and friends. A genial delight in a broad human contact, a total absence of self-consciousness, and a vivid sense of the significance of the seemingly trivial are qualities which make the author an entertaining diarist. She has humor. One feels in her casual survey a saner and more genuine appreciation of some of the intimate workings of the Soviet regime than is revealed in many duller and more pretentious volumes. R. H.

Selected Current Books

The Death of Society, by Romer Wilson. Doran.
The author of Martin Schuler writes a novel of tomorrow, the love-story of a genius.

The Labor Movement, by Frank Tannenbaum. Putnams.
"Its Conservative Functions and Social Consequences." Acording to the publisher, presents "only the favorable aspects."

Modern Irish Trade and Industry, by E. J. Riordan. Dutton.
A connected record of the main facts from 1850 on.

The Basque Country, painted by Romilly Fedden, described by Katherine Fedden. Houghton.
Charming illustrations in color.

Local Government in the United States, by Herman G. James. Appleton.
A close study of subdivisional government in the United States, with a brief survey of the French and English systems.

Contributors

WALTER N. POLAKOV is a consulting engineer of New York City.
JOHN DEWEY, professor of Philosophy at Columbia University, is at present in China.
ANNA PORTER is a resident of San José, California.
W. P. CROZIER is an Oxford man on the staff of the Manchester Guardian, and a well known writer on military and naval topics.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED